

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N<sup>O</sup> LXVIII. JULY 1892.

---

ART. I.—THE PLACE OF AUTHORITY IN  
RELIGIOUS BELIEF.

*The Place of Authority in Matters of Religious Belief.* By  
VINCENT HENRY STANTON, D.D., Fellow of Trinity  
College, and Ely Professor of Divinity in the University  
of Cambridge. (London, 1891.)

DR. STANTON'S book contains a real contribution to a very difficult theological problem. One can easily see that every point in his well-reasoned essay has been carefully thought out; and as the author possesses a solid practical judgment, shaped in the school of Butler, his conclusions merit our best attention. The peculiarity of the book is that it is not written from the theological point of view. Let us explain what we mean. The principle of authority examined from the theological point of view, would rest mainly on the delegated powers conferred upon the Church by Christ, and the supernatural gifts and graces given with this delegation, in order that it might be properly carried out. And in point of fact, up to the present time the argument has been conducted mainly from this point of view, whether on the side of the attack or the defence. Dr. Stanton treats the principle of authority from a purely natural point of view. Not denying, but leaving out of view, the supernatural side of authority, he considers it simply as a natural fact. As a simple matter of fact, authority exists and is exercised not only in the domain of religion but largely throughout the whole domain of human life. What is the import of this phenomenon? How are we to look at it? Are we to regard it as an illegitimate assumption of power over the minds of men, which ought to be left free? Or are we to regard it rather as a help to the mind in its pursuit of truth? If it is a help, has it any inherent worth,

VOL. XXXIV.—NO. LXVIII.

T

any cogency of conviction which is all its own? If we are able to answer these latter questions to any extent affirmatively, it is clear that an aspect of authority not hitherto examined or developed is brought out. And this aspect may serve as a solid basis on which we may erect the theological doctrine. But it is more than this. Authority viewed in its natural aspect really issues in a powerful argument in favour of Divine Revelation. It becomes a main element in the Logic of Faith.

Our interest in Dr. Stanton's book thus centres in the general principles he lays down; and for these reasons, in the observations we have to offer, we wish to give especial attention to these general principles.

Let us first with Dr. Stanton consider the position in which the question has come down to us, and on which it is generally argued. We find that it takes the shape of an antagonism between the principle of authority and the opposite principle of private judgment. On the one hand we have as defenders of the principle of authority the Roman and Anglican communions; and on the other, as rejecting that principle and setting in its place private judgment, we have the elder or orthodox Protestants, and the Broad Church Protestants in a descending line down to the pure Agnostics. An examination of the matter, however, shows that this antagonism has no real standing ground, and that so far as the principle of authority is concerned it completely breaks down; for many of the most vehement impugnors of authority will be found to be themselves the veriest slaves of authority. Let us look first at the defenders of the principle. If we take the Roman Church we see that in it the principle of authority has been carried to an extreme. In the Roman Church the principle of authority is viewed almost exclusively in its supernatural or theological aspect, so much so that nearly all its natural attributes drop off. The authority attributed to the judgments of the Church during early and mediæval times has been at length concentrated in the person of the Pope; and men are called upon to renounce their natural faculties and powers of investigation and to bow down before his decisions in all questions of faith and morals, accepting them as infallible. The Anglican communion has been much more moderate in her teaching as to authority. She simply lays down the great principle that the Church has authority in controversies of faith, leaving many subordinate and most important questions quite undecided. Dr. Stanton thinks, and we agree with him, that probably the best exponent of the



real Anglican belief is to be found in the views of the original Tractarians. At all events the views they advocated are supported by a long catena of the most eminent Anglican divines. The gist of these views is, that controversies are to be decided by the united witness of the Bible and the Church. The Bible is to be interpreted by the consentient testimony of the Primitive Church.

On turning to the opposition, the first class of persons to be taken into consideration is the older or orthodox Protestants. Professedly they repudiate altogether the principle of authority, and set up in its place the principle of private judgment. They claim that the overthrow of the principle of authority was the great triumph of the Reformation. Dr. Stanton thinks this contention might well be questioned; but it is not necessary here to do so. The real point is, how far are they borne out by fact in their professed rejection of authority? It will be found that though in words they reject the principle of authority, they do not do so in fact. For according to the Protestant theory the Bible viewed as an authority takes the place of the Church. We remember the old saying, 'the Bible and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants.' Orthodox Protestantism bows before the authority of the Bible, so that it comes to this, we have not really the rejection of authority, but only the substitution of one authority for another. And then the momentous fact remains that in our day, as we well know, the authority of the Bible is as much questioned as is the authority of the Church, and needs just as much to be vindicated. Nor is it easy, as experience has shown, to vindicate it, if the authority of the Church is disclaimed or discredited.

It might at first sight seem as if those Protestants who fall below the level of strict orthodoxy, and have ceased to regard the Bible as an infallible authority, might reasonably claim to have emancipated themselves. But an examination of their position shows that this is not the case. It is easy to see that those of them who still preserve a reverence for the Bible, have, to the extent of that reverence, admitted it as an authority. They may not admit it as an infallible authority; but an authority does not cease to be an authority if deprived of the mark of infallibility. It is an authority if it affords a ground or reason for the assent of the mind to the truths with which it deals. Nor does the case differ much if we descend still further in the scale of belief. Let us take the case of those who have altogether emancipated themselves from the Bible and its system, and who look forward to the creation of

what they call the religion of the future. Dr. Stanton has shown that they are as much under the dominion of the principle of authority as other people. Professedly, indeed, they rely solely on the perception of spiritual truth by the individual mind. But the question arises, Is such perceived spiritual truth capable of accumulation, or is there no spiritual truth except what each individual mind conquers for itself? It is plain that the latter alternative is practically impossible. There must be accumulation, the result of the labour of many minds. But with accumulation comes in necessarily the principle of authority; for the body of truth so accumulated can only be communicated so as to become the possession of the individual mind, on authority. This is practically acknowledged; for, as Dr. Stanton goes on to show, what these people look forward to is really the creation of a new Bible and a new Church. They dream of a Bible whose canon shall never close, and which shall be subject to revision from time to time in the light of advancing knowledge. They dream of a Church which shall embrace everybody and coerce nobody—a Church deprived indeed of infallible spiritual power, yet still a Church. Inasmuch, however, as both the new Bible and the new Church would exist for the purpose of influencing and teaching mankind, they would to that extent be authorities. Nay more, though not infallible they would yet be, according to the dream, very powerful authorities. Indeed, looking at the matter from a practical point of view, it may be doubted whether they would not exercise an influence as great as is exercised by authority in its most extreme form.

The result, therefore, of this examination is to show that the old antagonism between authority and private judgment completely breaks down. Authority cannot be got rid of in the summary way that was supposed of old. We see, in truth, that the principle of authority is completely inwoven with religion and religious knowledge. Unless we fall into pure Agnosticism and deny the possibility of all religious knowledge, we cannot get rid of it. For, as we see, the moment it is rejected in one form, it immediately starts into life in some other form. If authority is to be regarded as an evil, it can only be said that mankind have but a choice of evils. We may choose, for instance, with the Roman Church an infallible Pope, or with the Anglican the united witness of Bible and Church, or with the older Protestant an infallible Bible only, or with the newer Protestant a fallible Bible and a fallible Church, but in each case we are simply choosing our authority.

But the question as to authority assumes even a graver

aspect when it is looked at from a practical point of view. Take first the case of the young. How are they to be dealt with at all except on the principle of authority? It is clearly impossible. Evidently we cannot here carry out the modern principle of teaching tentatively, and advocating a suspense of judgment; for, as Dr. Stanton points out, this would really be, in the case of the young, to create a bias against the doctrine taught. If we are to teach the young at all, the religious knowledge communicated must be given as truth—that is, authoritatively. In fact, the common sense of mankind has decided that the young must be taught and trained authoritatively; for in no other way can they be put in possession of the stores of religious knowledge laid up in the Church. Nor would it do to delay religious knowledge till the mind is developed; for religion is a thing that cannot wait. It is a power which is calculated and intended to influence and leaven the life, and therefore must be communicated and taken possession of at once.

Admitting, then, that the young must be taught and trained authoritatively, we see what a grave fact this is when we come to think of it. We see how it deepens our idea of the import of the great principle of authority. For clearly in thus training the young we are thereby shaping the ideas, and in some degree impressing the character that is to belong to them through life; for it is only a small minority who have strength of character sufficient to emancipate themselves from early training. If indeed there were only one educating authority, say the Church of Christ, our whole sympathies would be on its side, and so far from being alarmed or staggered at its power, we should only wish it success. But practically there are many educating authorities; for, as we have seen, the overthrow of one authority is the setting up of another. There are thus many educating authorities, and it is in this fact that the gravity of the principle of authority is seen. We have only to look at the different types of conviction and character that are produced, say, under the influences of Roman or Anglican or Protestant or secular training (not to go beyond the Christian sphere) to see what an immense power a teaching authority wields.

But it is not only the young that are affected and trained by authority. The vast majority of mankind have neither the courage, the ability, nor the learning which would suffice to enable them to form an independent judgment. They receive their religious instruction on authority. It is on authority mainly that they are convinced of the inspiration

of the Bible and the dogmas of their respective Churches. They believe as they have been taught. Here is a fact which, the more we think of it, the more it rises in magnitude and import. If authority is an evil, it is a frightful evil; on the other hand, if it is a good, it is a very powerful good. But our idea would not be complete if we did not realize the persistence and strength with which systems of religion get seated and propagated for long times on authority. Everyone would acknowledge that the modern Roman system is a persistent and very powerful one. But it is the same with other systems. The system of Luther is a system just as compact and powerful. As a system it got fixed in the German mind in the age of Luther, and ever since it has ruled the German mind with unassailable authority. To show the amazing strength of this authority one single fact will suffice. We have had in Germany for the last century a continued flow of free criticism. It might have been thought that with this freedom we should have had a vast variety of modes of appreciation of the Christian system. We might have supposed that Christianity would have been approached and handled from every point of view. But it has not been so. We have had in the various writers every degree of affirmation and of negation, but the astounding fact is that none have been able to look at Christianity except from the standpoint of Luther. Every affirmation and every negation is rigidly confined to the horizon of Luther. It is the same with Calvinism. What we call Calvinism is much older than Calvin, the relation in which Calvin stands to it being simply that of having carried it forward in its logical development. It is a system of immense power, and as an authority has for a long period dominated the human mind. In order to see the way in which it works, and its great strength, we may take the instance of the Baptist communion. In order to realize the pure Calvinistic ideal this communion has, at a great sacrifice of human feeling, and in the teeth of the Saviour's words, excluded infants from the visible kingdom of Christ.

Before going on there are two remarks on these facts which we would like to add by way of parenthesis. The first is in correction of a widespread popular error. It is commonly supposed that Christianity, as taught by Christ and His Apostles, was a kind of pure Protestantism, and that in the course of little more than a century it changed into the opposite system of the Catholic Church. But in the light of the facts we have been considering we see that such

a change was impossible. Religious systems, when they have once been impressed upon men's minds, and have established themselves, do not change in this way. On the contrary, they cling most tenaciously and persistently to their leading ideas and principles. We may take it that the Christian system, as it emerges into light at the close of the second century, is in all its main features the same as that which was taught by Christ and His Apostles. Our second remark is in vindication of the authority claimed for the Church. The main objection to the theological doctrine of the authority of the Church is that it is something quite exceptional—an arbitrary imposition on the minds of men contrary to the nature of things and to what ought to be. The authority of the Church is inveighed against as a spiritual tyranny which ought to be swept away, in order to leave the minds of men free. The argument, in fact, supposes that perfect mental freedom will result if the authority of the Church is destroyed. But the facts we have been considering show quite clearly that this reasoning is grounded on mistake. There is no such freedom as the argument supposes. If the authority of the Church could be destroyed, the result would not be freedom, but only the substitution of another authority in its place. For the minds of men are and must be ruled by authority; and if they are not ruled by the authority of the Church, they will be ruled by some other authority. In truth we have here a solid basis for the doctrine of the authority of the Church. We see that Christ, if He wished His religion to spread and hold its ground in the world, had no alternative. He must give to His Church authority to teach in His name. And the words in which He gave this authority, instead of being ignored or explained away, ought rather to be cherished as an undesigned manifestation in Him of a wisdom and a knowledge altogether Divine.

But in making these remarks we have wandered somewhat from the standpoint of our author. His object is not to study authority in religion as an objective or historical fact, but rather to analyse it as a principle with a view to show its real nature and value. Is it a good or evil principle? Is it an incubus on the human mind crushing out the exercise of its powers, and so preventing the acquisition of real religious knowledge? Or is it really a help to the religious mind? Is it a solid support on which the soul can rationally stay itself? Is it something without which religious knowledge might become enfeebled or might die out altogether? These questions exhibit for the most part the attitude in which Dr.

Stanton regards authority. He does not approach the subject from the point of view of the theologian, but rather from the standpoint of doubting questioning minds of the present day. He seems to say: Have we not here under the somewhat forbidding name of authority a real and potent factor for the acquisition of religious knowledge? Let us look at it calmly as it really is and we shall see that it contains in it real and powerful proofs contributing to the reality of things believed in. We shall see, we repeat, that it is a part of the *Logic of Faith*. And Dr. Stanton's aim throughout his book is to mark out and define the influence which it exerts, and rightly exerts, on religious minds.

His general attitude may be seen from the definition which he gives of authority. It is to the following effect:—

'We may define "Authority" for the purposes of the present discussion, as that principle which is exhibited in all reasons for receiving, or assenting to, a truth, if such there be, which are external to the man himself, to his own observation, reasoning, or intuition, or which, if revealed internally, lie beyond the reach of his own verification. Our range of view must be confined within no narrower limits than this, if we are to form an estimate of what may be justly claimed for the principle of authority in things spiritual, and to see it in its true relation to the mental and moral constitution of man' (p. 12).

One main point with Dr. Stanton is the reconciliation of the claims of authority with the subjective reason and faith. He wishes to show that authority is not a dead force which is to overbear or crush out the subjective light. We easily see that from his point of view the reconciliation is not difficult. For it is clear that on the subjective reason lies in the first place the responsibility of recognizing and accepting the authority; and then, secondly, when the authority has delivered its witness or verdict, of testing as far as may be the truth of the verdict. Thus, for instance, take the case of one who from education or temperament rejects the idea of a visible Church as part of Christ's plan. We can imagine such a one led to study the origin of Christianity, and in the course of his studies being confronted with the fact of a visible Church existing from the time of the Apostles downwards, and bearing witness to its own origin and constitution. Here is a great fact which conflicts with his most cherished notions; and the witness of the early Church to itself is an authority. But how, as an authority, does it act upon and influence the inquirer, if he is influenced by it? Plainly, not by crushing out violently his cherished convictions, but



by convincing him of truth. He has first of all ascertained the facts about the existence of the Church, and the authoritative witness it bears, and then he judges with probability of the import, the meaning, and the truth of the witness. If he is led eventually to accept the witness, he is, in doing so, following the light of his conscience, not crushing it out. And thus we see how an authority such as that in question is really a help and an important factor in ascertaining the truth. By means of it we are enabled to reach, with a probability almost amounting to certainty, the plan and purpose of Christ.

Dr. Stanton proceeds to expound his view of the principle of authority in his second chapter; and we may briefly mention his mode of procedure. He first examines the nature and operation of authority in science; then he studies the same principle as it is exhibited in morals; and lastly, with the results thus gained he expounds its operation in religion. It turns out, however, that in dealing with religion a number of controverted questions turn up which have to be considered, and these digressions somewhat break and obscure the chain of reasoning. The chief of these incidental questions has reference to the nature of revelation and its authentication. We think it will be better to take this point first; and then in the brief sketch which we propose to give of the argument we shall be able to proceed without interruption and to exhibit it as a whole.

In considering the nature of revelation Dr. Stanton comes in conflict with Dr. Martineau. The latter inverts the ordinary use of the terms 'natural' and 'revealed' as applied to religion. He makes revealed religion simply equivalent to spiritual intuition. Revealed religion is made up of each man's perceptions of Divine things. Natural religion, on the other hand, is made up of spiritual truth derived from other sources. It may consist of spiritual truths contained in the Scriptures, or of what we get from the study of history, or what we learn from the testimony of others, or infer from observation of physical nature. Dr. Stanton very aptly criticizes this view:—

'As a question of terminology, and with a view to conveying a clear meaning, this change does not seem to be happy. One can understand, indeed, the purpose with which the word "revealed" is here applied; but there seems to be no suitability in his use of "natural," and we cannot but suspect that he would have discarded the word, had it not been for the historic contrast between it and "revealed." Further, it follows, if his language is adopted, that the

same truth which belongs to revealed religion, when I am thinking of it as evidencing itself in my own consciousness, changes into a truth of natural religion, when I contemplate it as evidenced to other minds' (p. 30).

But a far deeper question underlies this. It is clear that, according to Dr. Martineau, revealed religion is purely subjective, and that it has no other authentication than the subjective vision can give it. But surely this is a theory of revelation which is very inadequate and which could not stand the test of criticism. It is obvious to remark that a purely subjective authentication is inadequate, for what is felt to be truth by one mind might, and often is, felt to be error by others. There is thus no certainty, nothing, as the saying is, to go upon, and we can never be sure that the ideas or perceptions we cherish are not pure illusion. But in addition to this, let it be remarked that man's whole waking life is an objective life. All our knowledge of science and history is objective. Our social life, our every-day life, is objective. Nay, truth itself is objective, and to say that something is only subjective is equivalent to saying that it is not truth. The limitation of revelation to subjectivity is a self-contradictory procedure. And how impracticable it is, is shown from a single fact. A revelation is not worth much unless it issues in prayer. But prayer is an objective state, and it presupposes a whole series of objective truths. It presupposes the existence of a God who can hear prayer; it presupposes the relation in which He stands to the soul, and to the world generally—a series of truths which can only be established by an objective revelation or its equivalent. Besides, when we come to examine the so-called subjective spiritual intuitions, it is seen that for the most part they presuppose an objective revelation, and would fall to the ground or become profoundly modified if the objective revelation were taken away. In truth they are, for the most part, the perceptions of a soul which has been trained in the Christian life and has been formed by that life.

Dr. Stanton puts in opposition to this subjective system the old idea of an objective revelation. Of Dr. Martineau he says:—

'He ignores, to say the least, the possibility that men may be disciplined by that which they may have good reason for accepting, though they do not understand it, and seems to imply that there is no manifestation of truth without us fuller than that which can be apprehended by the individual mind, and having a stronger authentication than its own vision can give it. And the real question is whether this is so, or whether there may not be a spiritual recognition

of truth, which yet transcends our grasp, an unveiling of God and His Will, which we can truly know to be from Him, though it is made without and not within us—evidence as to His character, which is not contained in, however it may accord with, our intuitions, and which brings us an assurance, and therefore speaks with an authority which they cannot supply' (p. 32).

And then as an *argumentum ad hominem* he instances two facts which Dr. Martineau would not deny. The first is that our weak faith is often supported by our leaning upon some strong soul, and that we gain a sense of the certainty of spiritual things when doing so, which we lose when we return to ourselves. The second is that the whole volume of the spiritual experience of mankind is a fact vastly greater than the spiritual experience of a single individual. He urges that Dr. Martineau fails to take account of the significance of these facts, for they have a great weight and import even when taken in their simplest form. But Dr. Stanton claims that they lead up to, and prepare us to receive the conception of the prophetic office, and generally the Revelation of the Old Testament, together with the culmination of God's manifestation of Himself which we have in the Incarnation.

The author then goes on to specify the different kinds and degrees of light which may be said to make up the body of objective revelation. He deals in the first place with what would come under the head of natural religion or revelation. Here we think he perhaps concedes too much to the prevailing tendency of the present day when he says that a moral order and Divine purpose in the course of the world cannot be proved by observation or by the logical understanding. Such, no doubt, would be the verdict of that naturalistic philosophy which generally attaches to the doctrine of evolution. But we cannot regard that philosophy as other than a temporary cloud obscuring the intellectual world. There have been in the course of human history a long succession of such naturalistic systems, and the remarkable thing about them is, that after prevailing for a time they have one and all broken down and passed away. In this respect they stand in striking contrast with the antagonistic system, a theistic philosophy, which has continued on through ages without material change. According to Kant, all naturalistic systems are bound to break up, for two reasons. First, because, unlike theism, they cannot complete themselves; they cannot, as theism can, embrace the universe of things in a completed conception, but always hang in the air. Secondly, because they are, what theism certainly is not, profoundly self-contradictory. We

believe the present naturalistic philosophy is no exception to that rule. It may, indeed, take a long time before these flaws are made manifest to the general mind, but this must be the case in the end, and so soon as it takes place, the philosophy will break up and pass away. We do not, therefore, feel at all disposed to sacrifice the time-honoured discipline of Natural Theology at the bidding of such a system. At the same time, we think the view with which Dr. Stanton contents himself is a very true and real one. He attributes the conviction we have of moral truth in its higher aspects, as well as our conviction of a moral order and Divine purpose in the world, to the Eternal Word, the Revealer. We admit this in the fullest sense, but such an admission is not inconsistent with the tenet that human reason can recognize the existence of God and the moral order and Divine purpose of the world. Rather the two views are the complement of each other. It is because human reason is informed by the Divine Word, the Revealer, that it is able to reduce to a system these great truths.

Leaving this sphere of natural religion or revelation, Dr. Stanton next goes on to the formal statement of what is meant by 'revelation,' taken in its special sense. If we assume the substantial truth of Holy Scripture, we get an idea of a revelation the points of which our author specifies. Such a revelation is a communication to man of knowledge not attainable by ordinary means, and it covers the whole sphere of man's relation to God and to the higher world. It is an unveiling of God, of His character and attributes, and of His relation to the world and to man. How important this unveiling is, is seen from the fact that our knowledge of God derived from nature and internal sources stops short of this. It tells us much of God and of His Almighty power and wisdom, but it cannot speak to us of His character, it cannot tell us whether He cares for us individually, or whether He is our friend or our enemy. But God's character is fully revealed in the course of the Bible story. He there stands before the soul as the living and loving God, who is also the judge of all, and all His care and purpose in regard to man is shown. Looking at the mode in which this revelation was given, we find that sometimes it was given immediately, as when God spake to the Patriarchs by the angel of the Lord; sometimes it was given mediately by means of duly accredited Divine messengers, as in the case of Moses and the prophets, the highest under this category being God's Incarnate Word. Then, again, sometimes the revelation was

given and shone forth in facts. The Death of Christ and His Resurrection were such facts, so also the whole course of the history of the chosen people leading up to and culminating in Christ were revealing facts.

But it is not necessary to dwell further on this point. What has been said is enough to show that objective revelation stands in a category by itself, and we may therefore go on to the important question of how it is to be authenticated. Dr. Stanton allows that the main authentication is given, according to time-honoured belief, through external evidence: that is, by miracles and prophecy. Alongside of this, however, there is internal or moral evidence; such, we mean, as is afforded by the character of the revelation, and other considerations. He is, however, fully aware of the discredit thrown upon miracles and the supernatural generally in the present day, and for that reason he is inclined to insist more particularly on the moral evidence. He is far, however, from depreciating the supernatural evidence; rather he recognizes that, in the case at least of Christianity, it is quite indispensable.

'The need of external evidences—by which, in this place, historical evidences are specially meant—can never be removed by increased attention to moral evidences. For, as we have said, the revelation has been largely made through alleged facts. If they are not facts, there has been, so far, no revelation. In other words, the Christian faith, as has been often said, is a historical faith. From the circumstances, however, that the series of facts in question is of a unique character, and that a large element of the supernatural is included, which is unsupported by ordinary human experience, as to the laws governing phenomena, historical evidence of a strength which would otherwise be abundantly sufficient to establish the general truth of the facts, may well fail to carry conviction. It is here that the internal character of the revelation enters into, and may be justly allowed to exert a marked influence upon, the total estimate of the evidence. The antecedent improbability that must always lie against the miraculous as such, may be removed when its relation to the revelation with which it is connected, and the purpose and character of that revelation, have been duly taken into account. And thus a true comprehension and sympathetic appreciation of the significance of the revelation will rightly determine belief' (p. 41).

We think the contradiction of the miraculous to 'the laws governing phenomena,' which is here assumed, is perhaps exaggerated. Christian apologists of a bygone age insisted strongly on the contradiction, in the belief that they thereby strengthened their argument. And the extreme view they took got established and still prevails. It is not, however, observed that if we take our stand upon the human sphere,

and assume that mankind are not automata but rational beings, the whole sphere of human action contradicts 'the laws governing phenomena,' just as flatly as do the miracles of the Bible. And, further, if we assume still that human action is rational action, it will be exceedingly difficult to tell where the ordinary ends, and the miraculous begins. Let us reduce the supernatural in the Bible to its most general term, and what does it amount to but this? There are certain words and certain deeds recorded which point to God and the higher world, and which are believed to be the words and deeds of God. There is in fact a close analogy between God's revelation of Himself, and our revelation of ourselves to each other. How is it that we reveal ourselves to our fellow-men? It is by words which are recognized as our words, and deeds which are known as our deeds. And so it is with God's revelation of Himself. God's word has come to man, and has been recognized by man as God's word. It came first externally by the Angel of the Lord, and other outward tokens; then it came internally to the prophets; and, last of all, it shone forth visibly in the Incarnate Word. So it was also in respect of God's deeds. The great miracles of the old and new dispensations, and the facts of the history of God's people viewed as a whole, were recognized as God's acts. If this analogy is well weighed it is seen that the supernatural in revelation is after all very natural; and it is also seen that it belongs to the essence of revelation, and is quite inseparable from it. Take out of the Bible the words and the deeds of God, and the revelation quite vanishes.<sup>1</sup>

It must, however, be acknowledged that at the present day great difficulty is felt by many minds in accepting miracles and the supernatural generally. The Christian apologist, if he is wise, will take note of this. However much he may be convinced that this feeling rests on preconceptions which are erroneous, still he must recognize the fact of its existence; and doing so, he will without discrediting or setting aside the external evidence, rather make as much as possible of other kinds of persuasion. There is a large body of evidence which leads up to, and may ultimately bring about, acceptance of the supernatural, and which yet is felt to be cogent by modern

<sup>1</sup> The state of mind of those objecting to the supernatural is, often unconsciously to themselves, simply this: They have a feeling that there is nothing in the universe higher than necessary physical laws. To carry out their view consistently and logically they are bound to maintain that sentient life is mere physical movement, and that human beings are not rational beings, but automata. They are also bound to deny the existence of God and of the higher world.



minds. The reader will find much argumentation of this description in Dr. Stanton's book ; but our chief interest lies in his treatment of the principle of authority. It is the main object of his work to show how the principle of authority comes in as a help and an evidence in accepting divine revelation, and we wish as briefly as possible to give the outlines of his argument.

In order the better to bring out the attributes of authority in religious matters, Dr. Stanton examines the principle of authority in other departments. First of all he takes the case of authority in the higher departments of science—the mathematical and physical sciences. It is sometimes said that here authority has no place ; and, of course, that is true if authority is taken in the sense of *sic volo, sic jubeo*, or if it is held to be not subject to revision. Nevertheless it is unquestionable that there is such a thing as scientific authority, and that at times it mounts so high as to be esteemed practically infallible. It becomes, therefore, in view of religious authority, of the utmost importance to study the attributes of this authority ; and in order the better to bring out its analogies with authority in religion, it may be well to look at it from the outside. From this point of view, then, it would appear that scientific authority rests ultimately on the general conviction that there is such a thing as a body of scientific truth. Now how do the general public attain to this conviction ? In the first place no doubt from the testimony of scientific experts and teachers. Of course it might be objected that they are deceiving us. In old times this used to be a favourite method of getting rid of the authority of religious teachers. But when it is a question of science we see how weak the objection is. We have that confidence in the integrity of human nature in a high question like this that the idea of deception is excluded. Besides we know that if deception were attempted it would speedily be exposed. The fact that no such exposure exists, and that the testimony is consentient, convinces us that there is such a thing as a body of scientific truth. But in the second place, as outsiders, we are not altogether dependent on testimony. From popular manuals we are able to go a certain way in the apprehension of scientific truth, and so far as we can go, we see that it appeals to and satisfies our reason ; and we are convinced from this that if we had only the opportunity or ability to go further, the same result would be obtained. Here again we have an analogy with religious truths, many of which are above us ; but we see that these transcendent

truths are intimately bound up with other truths which we can understand and which we know to be true. But, in the third place, another evidence of the existence of a body of scientific truth is found from observing the magnificent results which it effects when applied to the objects and industries of human life. Just in the same way religious truths manifest themselves by the great effects they produce in human life and conduct when allowed full play.

We see, then, that there is such a thing as a body of scientific truth, and hence scientific experts who are its ministers become an authority. That they are an authority and are acknowledged as such no one will question. And there is this further analogy with religious matters that we often see in the case of those experts, one rising high above all others, and becoming what might almost be called a scientific prophet. His slightest word or indication is listened to with respect, and often with enthusiasm. No doubt his authority is not infallible, but it is powerful. Men believe, and believe rightly, that he sees much farther and deeper than others who have not attained his eminence.

But the chief question we have to concern ourselves with is the mode in which scientific authority is exercised. Dr. Stanton summarizes it under three heads, to which the reader's attention is specially invited on account of the place it holds in the argument. (1) *In the first place*, scientific authority acts for the instruction of the neophyte. It is of the utmost importance that one who intends to devote himself to the pursuit of science should at the earliest moment be put in possession of all such truth as science has already conquered. If it should be said he had far better keep his mind open, and not accept anything till he has been able fully to verify it, we see how such a proceeding would be a real loss. In accepting in faith scientific truth as already sanctioned and established, he is really elevated to a higher vantage ground. In possession of this acquired truth his intellect is not only strengthened, but he is in a position in which he can judge better of scientific truth as a whole, and of all its details. We see, however, that such a communication of acquired knowledge must be received on authority, and that it could not be received at all if the authority were destroyed. (2) *In the second place*, authority in science will guard the neophyte against scientific heresy, and will point out the true path on which good results may be obtained. The neophyte is not only warned against such futile efforts as circle squaring, and against spending his time on aims which it is im-

possible to reach, but the real gaps in science which it may be hoped can be filled up, and where his labours may be rewarded with success, are pointed out to him. (3) *In the third place*, scientific authority instructs and guides the opinion of the outside public; and it is here that it is seen in its most powerful aspect. For the public do not, as a rule, understand the grounds on which scientific deliverances rest; they receive them simply on authority. And the complete and contented submission which is the result is the measure of the strength of the authority.

The analogy in which all this stands to authority in religion is very evident; and its importance will be better seen if before leaving the subject of scientific authority we make a few further remarks.

If we look at authority in science as a whole, we see that it is a real and indispensable power. We see that without it, scientific truth could not be upheld at all. Individualism in science is an impossibility. No single human mind could support the whole fabric of scientific truth. If the force of authority were taken away, scientific truth would crumble into fragments, and ultimately must die out. Besides, the scientific explorer in a special department is not only supported and encouraged by the authority of his colleagues, but in any new induction he may venture on, authority from other departments of science plays an important part. It is not too much to say that the scientific explorer rests in an equal degree on his discoveries, and on the authority which is all about him. If his own observations and experiments might be viewed as his Bible, the scientific authority in which he lives and moves is his Church. Neither, it is true, is infallible; but taken together they are practically sufficient guides to lead him to the truth.

In passing from authority in science to authority in morals we get into an altogether different sphere. Scientific truth belongs entirely to this world. It is gained by means of observation and experiment from a study of the things around us; and it rests for its guarantee solely on the cognitive faculties which decipher the principles and laws underlying phenomena. It is quite different with moral truth. It cannot be demonstrated from experience. Even the utilitarian and materialist practically allow this; for they are obliged in their expositions to introduce an idea altogether foreign to physical science; the idea, we mean, of utility. This idea if looked at and analysed will be seen, just as much as the religious idea of morals, to raise the whole question into a different sphere.

Moral truth, in fact, does not, like scientific truth, rest on observation or experience of the world around us. It does not belong to the world at all, but is a possession of the human personality. It may be, and as a matter of fact often is, contradicted by the state of things which exists in and around us ; but this does not, as would be the case in science, destroy its character as moral truth. It rather, as in noble minds, intensifies the feeling of its truth, and animates the effort to make it prevail.

In regard to moral truth a most important question is, On what basis does it rest, and what is its guarantee? The answer is extremely difficult. In fact no formula has as yet been found which will exactly cover the facts of the case. The only thing we can say is that moral truth comes to the soul with a mysterious and awful sanction which is peculiarly its own. It is impossible to account for this sanction on any principle of experience—any principle belonging to this world. It seems to imply, as the deepest thinkers on moral truth have supposed, a higher world to which man in virtue of his spiritual nature belongs. It seems to imply the existence of One who is the Author of all things and the Supreme Judge of men. In no other way does it seem possible to account for this mysterious feeling of obligation and duty which attaches to all moral truth. It is true, no doubt, that moral truth, like scientific truth, is capable of progress. There has, in fact, been a gradual progress and elevation of moral ideas as civilization has advanced. But it is also true that each new or improved moral idea, as it attains to stability and acceptance, is immediately surrounded with the halo of this mysterious sanction. And in this connexion there is a remark of Dr. Stanton's of great weight and solidity which deserves to be reproduced inasmuch as it obviates a common misconception. 'Conscience,' he says, 'has often been spoken of as if it had itself a final and absolute perception of right and wrong. It far more closely resembles a judge who has a code to administer, which code is supplied from without, and has differed, and differs widely in different ages and places' (p. 26).

In estimating the nature of authority in the moral sphere we have to take into consideration this mysterious sanction. We see by it that there is an authority inherent in the truth itself ; and when the fact of this inherence is further analysed, the cause of the inherence is seen to be a Higher Power. Thus in respect of moral truth there is, *in the first place*, the authority or sanction of a Higher Power ; which Higher Power it may be is only vaguely felt so long as we confine ourselves

to the moral sphere. But *in the second place*, there is in respect of moral truth an authority of a different kind—a force of conviction coming to us from the moral perceptions and experience of our fellow men. There are great differences in the moral perceptions and experiences of different individuals. In some the perception of moral truth is keen and penetrating, and the sense of obligation is strong and powerful. In others both perception and sense are less keen and powerful. Most people have an experience which lies between the two; and we see, in the case of these latter, how, if they had no support, moral truth and its obligation might become enfeebled. It is a source of strength, support, and encouragement to such when they see how others around them have the same perceptions and the same feeling of obligation. They feel that there must be something in it since others share in the same perceptions as themselves. We thus see how the general judgment in moral matters becomes an authority. It is an authority on which not only the weak but even the strong can rely, and from which they can gain additional strength and confidence. And the ground of reason on which such an authority rests is very evident. We see it exemplified in common every-day matters. If, for instance, we perceive something in the distance, and hesitatingly conclude as to what it is, we may not be quite certain as to our conclusion. But if we find that everybody around us, looking at the same object, arrives at exactly the same conclusion, our confidence is increased. So in regard to moral truth, if we find that others arrive at the same conclusion, we are encouraged to believe that there is truth and reality in that which all believe they see.

And now to apply these results to authority in religion. If we look at the three analogies supplied by a study of authority in science we see how they illustrate and justify, and go far to show the necessity of that authority which is claimed by the Church in her teaching office. The two analogies supplied by a study of authority in morals are of a different character, and they serve to illustrate authority in religion in what may be called its apologetic aspect. It is in applying these two analogies to religion that Dr. Stanton chiefly busies himself; and he shows how authority regarded in this aspect may become a real help to us in our reception of Divine revelation. For *in the first place*, the same awful sanction which attaches to the truths of morals belongs also to the truths of revelation when they are fairly brought within the view of the soul; and *in the second place*, the soul is sup-

ported in its vision of their truth by the authority of multitudes—'the generation of God's children'—who have a like experience and vision.

Before, however, going on to illustrate these two points, it may be interesting to compare the three spheres of truth and authority, which we have examined, with each other. The truths of science are truths of this world. They rest upon observation and experiment applied to the things around us, and their guarantee is the human faculty of cognition. The truths of morals, on the other hand, are not truths of this world or of experience. They are rather, as a rule, contradicted by experience. At the same time they are a possession of the human mind, and have a mysterious sanction pointing to a higher world from which they come. Man in possession of them is raised above the world, and tries to subdue the world and its experience to that higher truth which he has in him. In morals we have the first attempt of man to rise above the world and to free himself from its fetters. When, lastly, we come to revelation, we have the completion of the upward movement begun in morals. The higher world vaguely manifested in the moral sphere now breaks in with the fulness of its light; and man rejoicing in this light is enabled to advance in the path to his complete emancipation.

But to return to the consideration of the two points in the argument. In regard to the first, viz. the authority that resides in the revelation itself, we see at once that if the Christian revelation is what it professes to be, a revelation from on high—God speaking to us in the person of His Son—it must possess an intrinsic sanction and authority. Every soul that sees it in that light must feel itself constrained and bound by it. The only question is, how can we be sure that God is really speaking to us in it? Of course the main evidence for that is the external evidence—the evidence of prophecy, the miracles and resurrection of Christ. But we are agreed at the present moment to leave out of consideration that evidence. We may therefore go on to ask, Is there anything in the revelation itself which shows that it comes from God? Are there any indications to show that the contents of the Christian revelation, like the moral law, have been and are felt by souls to have this supreme sanction and authority? Do souls feel and have they felt that we have here a word coming direct from God, which we are bound to obey? If we look at the people surrounding the Saviour, it is clear that His words came home to their hearts with a Divine force. Even the officers said 'never man spake like



this man.' The Apostles and first Christians had much external evidence in witnessing the works and the Divine life of Christ ; but it is clear that apart altogether from the personality of Christ and His works, there was something in the Christian faith, viewed as a whole, which evidenced to their hearts its Divine authority. It thrilled through their souls and found a response in their whole being. They felt that it was a light from on high—a great light which they who had hitherto walked in darkness had now seen. If again we look at the wonderful spread of Christianity in the first ages, we find that it was mainly due to this feeling of the divinity, the power, and the authority of the faith. The Christian evangelist delivered his message, and it flashed upon the soul of the hearer as a heavenly light. As evidence of this, Dr. Stanton appeals to the testimony of Justin Martyr and the Clementine Homilies, and many passages to a similar effect might be culled from the early Fathers. But another point as remarkable as the spread of Christianity is its persistence. It has lived for eighteen centuries in various countries often in spite of the most adverse circumstances ; and all through that period its wonderful vitality has been manifested in the revivals which have followed periods of alienation. When apparently almost ready to die, it has suddenly started into vigorous life. It would be difficult to explain these resuscitations on any other principle except that there is a Divine force in the faith which souls perceive and to which they respond.

Or, to look at the matter from another point of view, how shall we explain the martyrdoms except in the same way? The tortures and death to which they were exposed were very frightful ; and in all cases where the victim had a choice it is difficult to see how he could nerve himself to it on any lesser motive than the constraining power of what he believed. And hardly less significant than the martyrdoms is the case of the millions who have renounced the world in order that they might follow Christ. Whatever may be our opinion of the life they chose, and also after discounting cases of mixed motive, a large element remains of genuine choice. If wealth and pleasure and ambition, everything that the world holds most dear, was given up, surely it must have been under the constraining force of what they believed to be a word from on high. But, not to dwell on extreme cases, we see the same Divine power of the Word manifested all around us, it may be in a lesser degree. People live in a state of alienation and gradually, or it may be suddenly, they are awakened

and brought face to face with the Divine Word, and then they feel its power over them.

But it may be objected that it is only some minds who are influenced in this way, and that there are many others who are not so influenced. Dr. Stanton deals with this difficulty, and he does not hesitate to attribute it to a difference of moral state. In fact, we often see people who are impervious at one period, under the providence of God subdued and brought back. Dr. Stanton says :—

‘Now here we are brought face to face with the fact that the Christian faith evidences itself in this manner to some minds, but not to others. And, painful as it is to do so, we are compelled to trace back this difference to a certain difference of moral state. In saying this we must not be understood to assert an actual moral superiority on the part of all genuine believers in Christianity. We hold, indeed, that the Christian faith has a unique power to change the vicious and restore the fallen, while it brings to the most virtuous who receives it a potentiality of further growth in moral excellence, and its tendency is ever to produce a depth and refinement and completeness of character which are all its own. But individual Christians, who are even thoroughly sincere and earnest, may, and as a matter of fact do, fall far below individual unbelievers in moral attainment. The essential point of difference is that there is a certain view of human nature, marked especially by the sense of sin and of moral infirmity, and its necessary counterpart, aspirations after holiness, and there are certain convictions as to the things worth living for and dying for, which are bound up with the recognition of the truth of the Christian revelation. In part they are awakened by the knowledge of this revelation, in part they dispose the heart and mind to find in it the explanation of human life and destiny’ (p. 53).

And on these grounds Dr. Stanton bases his idea of the Christian consciousness which he tells us is to be thought alike as a pervading spirit, and a characteristic of individual minds. This Christian consciousness has in the course of ages produced a system of thought and a discipline of life, and it distinguishes certain minds which possess it from others. The idea, we think, is true in fact, but it might be dangerous to pursue it far, as it might detract from the universality of the Gospel. But, not to dwell further on the point, we may go on to ask, What is the exact logical or apologetic value which attaches to this constraining authority which resides in the Christian faith? It would be very difficult to estimate it, for to different minds it will appear very different. But, so much we can see clearly, its absence would be a serious thing. The Christian system professes to be a revelation from God, and, that being so, it would be ex-

tremely difficult on external grounds, to prove it to be such, if it did not exhibit that constraining power which such a revelation must possess. But we think that, apart from this consideration, there is a certain amount of direct cogency in the fact. If we see a thing anywhere, the presumption always is that the thing is really there to be seen. And if a great number of people see the same thing, that presumption becomes very strong. Thus we see how the *second* kind of authority in religion comes in to support the first, the authority derived from the consentient witness of others. If we are puzzled and doubtful about something which engages our attention, and can only come to a hesitating conclusion, that conclusion is immensely strengthened when we find that others attending to the same thing have arrived at the same conclusion. In precisely the same way our conviction of the great truths of religion, and our feeling of their force and authority, might be liable to considerable fluctuation if we found that we stood alone in believing them, but if we find that other minds, in fact a majority of the best men of all ages, have arrived at the same faith, our confidence and conviction is immensely strengthened. In respect of Christianity we have the testimony of generations extending over eighteen centuries. This is a great fact, taking it even in its simplest form, and if we add to it the consideration of the content of Christianity, which was felt by all these multitudes to be true and to be from God, it cannot be lightly got over.

This argument from numbers will, no doubt, be received with suspicion by many minds, and here it becomes important to look out for, and if possible to exhibit, the rational ground on which it rests. In order to do this, Dr. Stanton takes as an illustration the argument for the existence of God derived from the consent of mankind. The argument is well adapted to the purpose, and we shall try to bring it out as it appears to ourselves. It has, first of all, to be freed from the misunderstanding to which it has been subjected. Mr. Stuart Mill, for instance, was so impressed with the idea that it was a weapon in the hands of his philosophical opponents, the intuitional school, that he quite failed to see its real force as an argument. We may set aside altogether the question as to whether our belief in God rests upon a primitive intuition. There is much that might be said in favour of it, and many of the greatest lights in philosophy, from St. Anselm downwards, have believed in it. But in order to see the real force and cogency of the argument from consent, it is better to assume the position taken up by Mr. Mill, and to regard the existence

of God as a conclusion drawn *à posteriori* from certain proofs or indications. There is, for instance, the argument from design in nature, on which Mr. Mill lays the greatest stress; and to this Dr. Stanton adds as the most significant part of the evidence, apart from revelation, 'the indications that man belongs to a spiritual order, and is responsible to some higher power, the prickings of remorse, the sense of shame and sin, with which he is visited, and the signs of moral purpose in the world around him, in the laws of his own being, and in many events which affect his own life' (p. 59). To these proofs and indications more might be added, but it is not necessary in the present connexion to do so.

Now let us suppose that the belief in God's existence is a conclusion drawn from these or similar proofs and indications, it is clear that if a man stood absolutely alone in drawing the conclusion, he might have much reason to doubt whether he was right. But when he finds that innumerable minds—in fact, the whole human race—starting from the same or similar grounds, have arrived at the same conclusion, we see how immensely his trust in his conclusion is strengthened. The consent of mankind is clearly an authority which carries the greatest weight. And our idea of its weight will be raised even higher if we take into view another consideration. We have supposed that the conviction of God's existence is derived from special proofs and indications, and this no doubt is to a certain extent the fact. At the same time, however, it is certain that the formulized proofs and indications do not exhaust the reasons which lead to this belief. Those who have studied most the formal proofs and reasonings have come to the conclusion that they do not cover the whole ground, and even that part of the ground which they do cover they do not express fully. If, then, we bear in mind that reasoned proofs and indications constitute only a small part of the reasons for believing in God's existence, and also that the human mind has an immense amount of evidence which has never been formulized, and which possibly could not be expressed in any formula, and set these considerations alongside of the fact that all nations have believed in God, the argument from consent becomes very strong.

It is thus seen that the argument from consent is not without a real ground of reason. It is the conclusion, not of an individual mind, which on a great subject like this might go astray, but the judgment of innumerable minds, all turned towards the same object. It might indeed be said, the idea of God is in a large measure an idea transmitted from generation

to generation. And this no doubt is quite true, and to the extent of its truth must be discounted. But on the other hand it is to be remembered that the idea could not be transmitted, and spread so as to become universal, unless it had a solid ground in the intelligence and heart of mankind. The fact, also, that a large portion of the grounds of belief are undefined, and perhaps indefinable, as it increases, as we have shown, the weight of the general judgment, so it is not without bearing on the present case. For there is a similar undefined ground of cogency in the acceptance of the Christian revelation. The initiated Christian has not only all the grounds of acceptance which are clear to the outside student, but he has a further light shining on him from within. As soon as he enters into the inner sanctuary he really enters the portals of a higher world, and is subject to the influences and light which proceed from that world. This of course, as it is something indefinable, cannot be used as an apologetic argument. Nevertheless, it is a thing which ought not to be lost sight of in trying to estimate the value of the authority derived from the general judgment.

The passage in which Dr. Stanton applies the argument from consent to the reception of revealed truths is characteristic, and gives a good idea of his style and manner.

'In the case of the belief in the truths of revealed religion there is a special element. The common judgment, which in part confirms that of individuals, in part determines theirs, and is followed by them where they cannot see for themselves, is that of a body of persons united by strong ties of sympathy, and distinguished from the rest of mankind by certain well-defined principles which they share. For all that is most essential in the Christian faith we have means of verification which are altogether unique among all cases of the kind which we are considering, supplied by the common consent of an innumerable multitude of every race, of every variety of natural character and social and intellectual grade, among countless generations of mankind who have lived under the most divers general conditions of life and thought. The power of the revelation is verified, its purport and the relation between its essence and its form are illustrated, in the life of moral and spiritual experience. Through faculties quickened by such experience, its correspondence with the constitution of our own being and with the indications of Divine Providence in the course of the world is recognized. Here, however, are matters in which the consentient experience and judgment of many must count for infinitely more than the experience and judgment of one, even if that one be myself. However profound might be my own impression of the truth of the faith, I might naturally hesitate to believe in it if I stood alone. But I am sustained by the common faith of Christian believers, who have manifested its

fruits in their lives. My own faith is, it may be, but feeble ; I am but a beginner in the ways of God. But such immediate knowledge of Divine things as I have fits in with what others plainly declare. In hours of darkness and distress, and when surrounded with able and upright men who do not believe, and confronted with serious intellectual difficulties with which faith may seem to be beset, I can lean on this support, and I am sure that I behave rationally in so doing. If I rejected it I should be guilty of "dealing treacherously with the generation of God's children." Whatever is most admirable in humanity, whatever most commends itself to my conscience, and commands my sympathy and affections, I see in them. And I know that at times, and even on the whole, I have at least dimly perceived the truths which they see so clearly' (p. 63).

We have occupied so much space in discussing the general question of authority that we have little left to enable us to do justice to Dr. Stanton's rendering of the authority of the Bible and of the Church. But we confess that our chief interest lay in the general question as to the intrinsic worth of authority and the rational ground on which it rests. We think this point is of importance in the present day, and that authority is not estimated according to its actual worth. If, for instance, we are told, as we must be told, that we receive the Bible and its inspiration mainly on authority ; or if we are told that Christian theology and the whole ritual and worship of the Church rest mainly on the authority of the Church, nineteen-twentieths of English people would feel inclined to say, if they did not actually speak it out, that authority is really no guarantee for the truth of these things. But our desire has been to show that this is really not so. We have tried to show that there is a real rational ground on which authority rests. It is true that authority has not an equal strength at every point. In some points it only raises a strong presumption or probability, while at others it rises into a degree of cogency which practically amounts to certainty. But at all times, if it is a real authority, it possesses some weight.

In regard to the Bible it is clear that to deal with it exhaustively would involve many intricate investigations, in fact would raise all the questions of criticism and historical investigation which are now being discussed. This would not coincide with the scope of Dr. Stanton's book which, as he says, is simply 'to get the question as to the Divine authority of the Bible into shape.' The author's object, as he further explains, is 'to distinguish between different views that have been taken of it ; to consider what kinds of proof are applicable to the subject, and how much may conceivably be



proved; and to assign their respective parts to moral and historical evidence, to individual judgment, and the authority of commonly accepted Christian beliefs' (p. 70). The points here raised are very important, and it is clear the discussion of them, apart from other burning questions, would be useful.

The general view taken by our author of the Bible is that our acceptance of it as a Divine revelation rests mainly on authority. The books of the Canon of the Old Testament we receive on the authority of the Jewish Church, and the books of the Canon of the New on the authority of the Christian Church. In the case of the establishment of the Canon of the New Testament, we know how carefully it was set about. It was the result of a long process, and it was only when that process was complete that the Church set her seal to it. There were three great elements involved in this process. There was, first, the mark of apostolicity, or at least apostolic sanction, which must attach to every book pretending to a place in the Canon. Then, secondly, there must be the witness of the souls of the general body of the faithful to what was felt to be the inspiration of the book; and, lastly, there was the comparison and ascertained agreement of the contents of the book with the Canon of the faith handed down in the Church and embodied in her constitution and worship. No book could be allowed a place in the Canon unless it could stand all these tests, and it was only when the tests had been fully applied, and general agreement had resulted, that the Church fixed the Canon. The great care taken in this process affords a presumption that a similar care and caution were employed in fixing her Canon by the Jewish Church; and every indication that we possess, slight though the evidence may be, shows that this was the case. The Jewish Church was dominated by a similar spirit, and it had every motive for care and caution in a matter so high and involving such high interests. The fixing of the Jewish Canon must have begun in early times, and it was completed in the age of Ezra. The profoundly interesting picture which we have of the religious life of the time of Ezra—the deep piety, the strong faith in the revelation of Jehovah, the reverence for the prophets and their writings, and the general integrity and uprightness of the leading men, all has an important bearing on the question of the Jewish Canon. It is a guarantee that every care was taken of what was believed to be the inspired Word of God. Certainly it excludes any theory which necessarily supposes tampering with the letter, or reconstructions of the Divine Word, or falsifications on a great scale.

But we have in regard to the Canon of the Jewish Church the testimony and authority of Christ, who sanctioned it. This is a fact which cannot be lightly got rid of by anyone who believes in the Incarnation. What is the doctrine of the Incarnation? We say, and say with the utmost confidence, that any doctrine of the Incarnation other than that decided on in the Councils of the Church, and expressed in the Athanasian Creed, cannot stand, but must melt away into pure humanism. Now, according to the definition of the Church, the Divine and the human natures in Christ are united in one Person—the Person of the Eternal Son. Let us reflect on this, and we shall see that this consequence follows: the same Person who knew finitely as man, knew infinitely as God. Behind, or rather above and encompassing, every act of His human knowledge there was the light of His infinite knowledge. Now this seems to exclude wholly either error or ignorance in regard to any human subject with which as man he chose to deal.

In addition to the authorities mentioned Dr. Stanton brings forward another, viz. the authority of Christian scholars. It is an undoubted fact that amongst those who have most thoroughly investigated the historical evidence affecting the Scriptures there are many competent scholars who have arrived at the conclusion of their substantial truth. No doubt there are other scholars who have arrived at a different conclusion, and the followers of these last in the public press are apt often to claim for them an exclusive title to scholarship. But Dr. Stanton well observes that the line of cleavage between the two classes is not between men possessed of high critical acumen and learning and others destitute of these qualities, but between those who start from different sets of principles. If a man starts from the principle that there is no such thing as the supernatural—that is, no such thing as a revelation from God in the true sense of the word—we see how profoundly this must affect his whole criticism of the records of revelation. To give a parallel case, let us suppose the case of a criticism of the naval history of England by a man who (if we can imagine such a thing) did not believe in the sea or in sailing. If such a thing took place we see how profoundly his faith or want of faith must affect the conclusion at which he arrives. The critic in question might very ingeniously resolve the battle of Trafalgar into an ordinary land battle, and might demonstrate how its naval character had been given to it by the superstition of the narrators who believed in the sea and in sailing. But we see clearly that this result

is arrived at, not by the evidence of the facts which were before him, but by the principles with which he set out. And so it is in the case of the Bible. Plain Christian men are able to see and to judge of the principles of a critic, and the spirit in which he works. And the fact that critics who discredit the supernatural are led also to discredit the records of the Bible, will not deter them from following the judgment of other critics, equally able, who are in harmony with themselves as to great principles.

The Canon then of Scripture comes to us on authority, but the proof of the Canon is only the first step; it is not the proof that Scripture is a revelation. Something further is necessary for this purpose. And we may again remark that here the external evidence must come in and must form the backbone of our conviction. But at present we are looking, not at the external evidence, but at what may be gathered, in the way of persuasion, from other sources. As a contribution to such secondary evidence Dr. Stanton applies the theory he has been sketching to the Bible.

He first of all distinguishes between revelation and inspiration. This distinction we regard as of great importance, but at the same time it is one which ought not to be pressed too far. There is a clear distinction no doubt between the spiritual vision of the seer and the narrative in which that vision is recorded for the instruction of mankind; but there is a point in which both meet, viz. the person of the seer. For instance, in the case of the Pentateuch, there is a clear distinction between the series of Divine communications given to Moses, beginning with the appearance of the angel of the Lord at the burning bush, and going on all through the history—there is a clear distinction between these revelations and the history itself. Still the revelations, so far as regards ourselves, are dependent on the history, and both history and revelations meet in the person of Moses; for we hold it essential to believe that, if Moses did not personally write the narrative, it was written under his superintendence and direction. Dr. Stanton's idea, however, is rather to look at the whole Bible as a closed Canon, in the shape in which it comes before ourselves. When so looked at we may distinguish in it what may be viewed as revelation coming from God and the remainder of the narrative. He says :—

'By fixing our thoughts at times on the revelation itself which has been made, as distinguished from the records of it, we are, in the first place, more likely to do justice to the general scheme of revelation; we are able to trace the purpose running through it; its

chief truths stand out, and the relations of its various parts are perceived ; it is shaped in our minds into a doctrine of which we understand the significance, and can give to ourselves a rational account' (p. 71).

He thinks that for this purpose, besides a spiritual appreciation of the significance of the revelation, we need only a conviction that the records are substantially trustworthy. He would even go a step further and add that if we are able to rely only on a portion of the documents we shall have sufficient evidence for the main facts. This latter statement may perhaps be true, but if we are driven to it, we shall find that it involves consequences which are very grave, and which might have a reflex action on the principles from which we set out.

But our author points out that this view of the substantial truth of the narrative, and of there being perceptible therein not only the narrative but a revelation from on high, is one on which we cannot finally rest. We are driven onwards to some view of inspiration. The moment we begin to ask such questions as the following (and we cannot help asking them), a view of inspiration is necessarily involved in the answer. Is the revelation co-extensive with the records, or do the records contain other matters besides? Is the revelation a completed whole, the earlier books leading up to and preparing for the supreme manifestation of God in Christ? Is the collection of books, belonging as they do to different ages, characterized by a singular unity? Are they pervaded by one spirit, and do they contribute to a common end? And is the Bible, taken as a whole, marked by a unique spiritual power? It is clear that if we ask these questions, and are able to answer them in the affirmative, we are already committed to a doctrine of the inspiration of the Bible and its authority. For we cannot come to these conclusions without acknowledging a special Divine influence, which must have controlled the minds of the writers.

Dr. Stanton lays great stress, and we think justly, on this view of the matter. It is clearly the great argument which will come home to the minds of plain people, who have neither the leisure nor the ability for deeper inquiries. But it is not limited to these. It is an argument which must come home to all minds. And the author goes on to show how at this point the principle of authority for which he has been contending comes in. Just as the man of science is surrounded by an atmosphere of scientific authority, which supports and guides him, so the Christian lives in a similar atmosphere.

The convictions and conclusions obtained from his own study of the Bible are confirmed and enlarged by the common judgment of Christians of all ages. It is clear that authority, viewed in this light, is a great help. No individual could for himself have fixed the Canon of Scripture. He has to rely for this on the testimony of the early Christian Church and the elder Jewish Church, which is assured to him by his own spiritual perception and the judgment of others. So in the judgment which he forms of the Bible as a revelation from God, he is supported by the common judgment. And this common judgment is not confined to the past. It is a continuous living authority, on which the individual can rely.

After the statement of his main argument, of which we have been able to give only a very meagre account, our author goes on to discuss the question of inspiration. He takes into view the different theories that have been propounded, 'verbal,' 'plenary,' and so on. And he asks the question whether any definite theory of inspiration can be proved. This he decides in the negative. Our own impression is that the question should be approached from a somewhat different point of view. Our author starts from the idea of a closed Canon, which is or is not an inspired *book*. But if we look back at the views of the earliest Fathers, we see that they looked rather to inspired *men*. Theophilus of Antioch speaks of the 'Spirit-bearers' (Πνευματοφόροι). We think from this latter point of view it might be possible, if not to construct a theory of inspiration, at least to give a rational account of it—an account which would leave, in regard to the Scriptures, freedom as great as, or perhaps greater than, the other view leaves. We cannot at present enter upon this question, nor can we follow Dr. Stanton further. We would, however, heartily commend his book to our readers.

---

#### ART. II.—DR. JOHNSON'S LETTERS.

*Letters of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* Collected and edited by GEORGE BIRKBECK HILL, D.C.L., Editor of Boswell's *Life of Johnson*. Two Volumes. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892.)

READERS of that supreme 'Biography' which Lord Macaulay has ranked as 'first without a second,' will recall the various illustrations which it gives of Johnson's capacities as a letter

writer. They may remember, for instance, the 'celebrated letter' (as Boswell truly calls it) to Lord Chesterfield; the exquisitely tender condolence with James Elphinston on his mother's death; the 'polite and urbane' letter to Charles Burney while as yet undistinguished; the courteous but pointed rebuke to a mother who had importuned him to 'solicit a great man to whom he had never spoken, for a young person whom he had never seen, upon a supposition which he had no means of knowing to be true'; the noble indignation expressed to his friend William Drummond against an attempt to impede the translation of the Bible into Gaelic; the sternly defiant acknowledgment of Macpherson's 'foolish and impudent letter'; the advice to 'a young clergyman in the country,' almost verbally anticipating Keble's line, 'By blameless guile or gentle force';<sup>1</sup> the sadly significant announcement to his landlord that it had 'pleased God to deprive him of the power of speech'; the irrepressible cry for sympathy, 'O my friend, the approach of death is very dreadful,' followed almost instantly by two such sentences as 'Let us learn to derive our hope only from God—in the mean time let us be kind to one another'; the reply to his little godchild's 'pretty letter,' with the closing advice, 'that through your whole life you will carefully say your prayers and read your Bible'; and the dignified gratitude for Thurlow's munificent offer, which he declines only because if he were now to 'appropriate so much of a fortune destined to do good,' he would hold himself guilty of advancing 'a false claim.' Such letters, although they may lack the charm of Gray's or Cowper's, or, we may add, of Scott's, have all the strength, distinctness, and reality, which were inseparable from the majestic personality of the writer.

Dr. Birkbeck Hill, the most recent editor of the *Life*, has now enhanced his own strong claim on the gratitude of 'Johnsonians' by collecting all those letters of Johnson's which are not included in Boswell's work. 'I have not thought it right,' he says, 'to pass over any on account of their insignificance.' He pleads that those which he now gives to the world—many of which had been already published by Mrs. Piozzi—will secure for Johnson 'a far higher rank among letter writers than he has as yet filled.' 'Admirable as many of those [letters] are which are published by Boswell, nevertheless in the *Life* they are overshadowed by his super-

<sup>1</sup> 'Such honest, I may call them holy artifices, must be practised by every clergyman; for all means must be tried by which souls may be saved.'—*Life of Johnson*, ed. Dr. Hill, iii. 438.



lative merit as a talker . . . His letters may be good, but his talk has no rival ; ' but when we no longer have it to tempt us, we shall not fail to recognize how admirable he was in his correspondence.' This is quite true. The volumes before us do indeed present ' fine and weighty passages in which he treats of the greatest of all arts, the art of living ; ' ' strong common sense, set forth in vigorous English, on which his friends could always draw in their perplexities ; ' and also ' a playfulness and lightness of touch which will surprise those who know him only by his formal writings,' and may make up, in some degree, for the loss involved in Miss Burney's over-sensitive objection to supplying Boswell with specimens of Johnson's correspondence with herself. We may add that although the letters now published abound in quotations from, or references to, famous writers of all ages—Hesiod, Aristotle, Galen, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Cicero, Tacitus, Martial, Severus, Shakespeare, Sir Philip Sidney, Milton, Cowley, Dryden, Pope, Addison, Swift, Rochefoucault—yet the reader feels in every case that this rich and ' full mind ' is recalling the passage because it cannot help doing so : of pedantry or ostentation there is not the shadow of a trace.

That Dr. Birkbeck Hill has performed his task with indefatigable assiduity and true ' Johnsonian ' enthusiasm, goes without saying. At the same time, the criticism which was passed on his annotations to the *Life* is not, we think, wholly inapplicable to similar work in the goodly volumes before us. There is, if it be not ungracious to say so, a little too much of his own individuality in his comments. One does not particularly care about knowing that he considers ' Walter Scott disgraced by being one of the correspondents of ' that ' affected, tiresome, spiteful, and mendacious creature, Anna Seward.'<sup>1</sup> He cannot let a reference to Sir Joseph Mawbey pass without not only quoting from the ' *Rolliad*,' about the Speaker Cornwall as enduring Mawbey's eloquence, but adding—one might say, dragging in—the following personal reminiscence : ' I thought when I saw my friend, Mr. Leonard H. Courtney, sitting as chairman of committee, that to him, as member for a division of Cornwall, these lines might be aptly applied.'<sup>2</sup> He conjectures that a shoeblack to whom Johnson's friend Dr. Taylor, of Ashbourne (of whom more presently), left his property, with a proviso that he

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, i. 10. We by no means take up the cudgels for this sentimental *précieuse*, whose conceit, fostered by compliments, is pleasantly alluded to by Mrs. Oliphant, *Literary Hist. of England*, i. 233.

<sup>2</sup> *Letters*, i. 333.

might take any name but that of Taylor, 'was his illegitimate son.'<sup>1</sup> It may have been so, but Johnson's letter in the text does not, we think, support this charitable suggestion. Johnson writes to Mrs. Thrale on April 4, 1776, that Thrale 'said that he would go to the house;' whereupon we have a note, 'The House of Commons, I conjecture. On April 1, if he attended, he heard a debate on expenses' of the American war; then comes a quotation from Lord North's speech in that debate; after that, a reference to the increase in the national debt on account of that war, with a quotation from Gibbon about 'supporting' it.<sup>2</sup> This is mere 'padding,' and similarly Johnson's allusion to the closing of the Bodleian for one week in the year is made the peg for a long note on the negligence of eighteenth-century custodians, not only of that library, but of 'Dr. Radcliffe's' as well.<sup>3</sup> Passages in the text of vol. ii. pp. 67, 100, are repeated in notes on pp. 212, 209; while here and there a note seems deficient in point of information. Once or twice Dr. Birkbeck Hill offends against good taste, or even good feeling, rather more seriously. When Johnson quotes Sulpicius Severus about St. Martin, Dr. Hill informs us that he was 'Bishop of Tours in the fourth century,' but apparently cannot resist the temptation to add a ponderous sarcasm from Gibbon about the great missionary 'imprudently committing a miracle.'<sup>4</sup> Much worse, and deserving of grave reprehension, is what we find further on. Johnson writes to a 'dear friend,' Joseph Fowke: 'Whether we shall ever meet again in this world, who can tell? Let us, however, wish well to each other; prayers can pass the Line and the Tropics.'<sup>5</sup> And Dr. Hill thinks good to observe in a note, 'Prayers apparently would take the longer course round the Cape of Good Hope.' Respect for the religious belief of many readers, if not for that of his hero, whose conviction as to the efficacy of intercessory prayer is remarkably apparent in the *Letters*,<sup>6</sup> ought surely to have restrained the editor from setting down in his manuscript, or at any rate from retaining in his proof, a sneer so vapid and so ignoble. Dr. Hill, we fear, would hardly echo Carlyle's confession in his book on *Heroes*: 'The church of St. Clement Danes, where Johnson really worshipped in the era of Voltaire, is to me a venerable place.' But we prefer to think of the eminent services which the editor has rendered, in this as in previous works, to the study of Johnson's life and character; and we proceed to

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, i. 380.<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 77.<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 290.<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* i. 386.<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 192.<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 211, 214, 281, 308, 395, 428.<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* i. 409.

take note of the chief features of the correspondence here presented to us in a form which is, on the whole, so attractive.

The date of the first letter in the series is October 30, 1731. Johnson was then twenty-two; as Dr. Hill ascertained by a painstaking inquiry,<sup>1</sup> he had left Pembroke College (without a degree) nearly two years before; he was living at Lichfield, 'not knowing,' says Boswell, 'how he should gain even a decent livelihood.'<sup>2</sup> He thanks his relation Mr. Hickman for favour and assistance, but begs to be excused from composing verses on the subject of a recent disappointment. The letter which the editor considers 'the gem of his collection,' and which he 'owes to the liberality of Mr. William R. Smith, barrister-at-law, of the Inner Temple,' is one in which 'the fond and youthful husband' of thirty addresses the wife of over fifty as his 'dear girl' and 'charming love.'<sup>3</sup> The reader inevitably smiles; but there must have been more in the 'Tetty' whose memory was so long and sacredly cherished, than Garrick's description of her person and manners would suggest. 'She seems,' writes Mr. Leslie Stephen, 'to have been a woman of good sense and some literary judgment.'<sup>4</sup> She died in March 1752, three years after this letter was written; and seven years later, his mother's last illness and death called forth those indescribably touching letters to her and to her step-daughter, Lucy Porter, which Dr. Hill has inserted in 'Appendix B' to the first volume of the *Life*, and which he incorporates in the text of the *Letters*. Miss Porter, in after days, disappointed Johnson by her frivolity and her waywardness: in 1775, for instance, he remarks, 'She is very good-humoured while I do just as she would have me;'<sup>5</sup> and again, 'Lucy is a philosopher, and considers me as one of the external and accidental things that are to be taken and left without emotion;'<sup>6</sup> but now under the presence of their common bereavement he writes, 'Every heart must lean to somebody, and I have nobody but you. . . . Pray, my dearest, write to me as often as you can;'<sup>7</sup> he sends her the

<sup>1</sup> *Dr. Johnson, his Friends and his Critics*, p. 329 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Life*, ed. Dr. Hill, i. 79.

<sup>3</sup> *Letters*, i. 5.

<sup>4</sup> See his excellent volume on 'Johnson' in the series of *English Men of Letters*, p. 13. In the last year of his own life Johnson arranged for a stone to be placed over her grave. *Letters*, ii. 411; *Life*, i. 241.

<sup>5</sup> See *Letters*, ii. 335; cf. 359.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* i. 180. So, in i. 191, 'Miss Porter will be satisfied with a very little of my company.' This was in 1772.

<sup>7</sup> So in 1768, when Miss Porter's aunt died, 'My dear, dear love,' he writes from Oxford, 'you have had a very great loss. . . . Whenever I can do anything for you, remember, my dear darling, that one of my greatest pleasures is to please you.' *Ibid.* i. 139.

'little story book' which he has published, and which we know as *Rasselas*, begging her to tell him 'how she likes it,' as if her opinion would be of value;<sup>1</sup> and he adds many tender messages to 'poor Kitty Chambers,' his mother's old servant.<sup>2</sup> In this period of Johnson's life we find him discussing *Clarissa* with Richardson, and pleading for an accurate index; pouring himself out to Joseph Weston in sympathy for 'poor dear Collins,' whose mind had passed from depression into lunacy; corresponding with Miss Hill Boothby in terms of affection which might seem extravagant, if one did not remember how 'Johnson, like all good men, loved good women'<sup>3</sup>; begging her to 'continue her prayers for him that no good resolution may be vain,' yet declining to be directed by her in religious matters; full of anxiety as to her failing health, and giving her the benefit of his medical studies (which were probably prejudicial to his own health) by prescribing dried orange peel for dyspepsia.<sup>4</sup> We hear thus early of the blind lady, Miss Anna Williams, who having come under his roof on a visit to his wife, became a lifelong and valued, though sometimes querulous inmate,<sup>5</sup> claiming, as Boswell found when he had to propitiate her about the famous Dilly dinner, a certain control over her benefactor's engagements, but 'pleasing' him by her 'great merit, both intellectual and moral,' by her 'comprehensive knowledge' and her 'steady fortitude,' and 'for thirty years,' as he expressed it, filling towards him the place of 'a sister,' until her death left him 'desolate' about a year before his own.<sup>6</sup> Mr. Taylor has been already mentioned, and he soon becomes a prominent figure in the correspondence and illustrates that tenacious fidelity of Johnson to old

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, i. 82, 87.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* i. 91, 111, 127. When he hears of his pension, it is natural to him to say, 'Be so kind as to tell Kitty,' *ibid.* i. 93. Later, in 1767, he took a solemn leave of her, after praying by her bedside partly in the words of the Visitation Office. This is that 'tender and affectionate scene' which Boswell commends to the 'candid' consideration of those 'who have been taught to look upon Johnson as a man of a harsh and stern character.' *Life*, ii. 44.

<sup>3</sup> Leslie Stephen, p. 13.

<sup>4</sup> *Letters*, i. 47-49. We cannot agree with Dr. Hill that in these letters Johnson 'seems to affect a style that would have better become a spiritual novel.' They exhibit the writer's religious good sense as well as his piety of feeling. 'No man can know how little his performance will answer to his promises. . . . Surely no human understanding can pray for anything temporal otherwise than conditionally.'

<sup>5</sup> Once, speaking of his ill-assorted household, he says, 'We have tolerable concord at home, but no love. Williams hates everybody.' *Letters*, ii. 77.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 336, 348.

friends as such, apart from any question of intrinsic congeniality, which appears in the letters to Edmund Hector, a medical man at Birmingham; in the solicitude for his cousin and playmate, the improvident Tom Johnson;<sup>1</sup> in a reference to Harry Jackson, whom he entertained at dinner on a visit to his native city in 1776, and whom Boswell found to be 'a low man, dull and untaught';<sup>2</sup> and in the visits paid to 'poor Charles Congreve,' who had drifted through ill-health into habits of 'sordid self-indulgence,' and 'confessed a bottle a day.'<sup>3</sup>

John Taylor, who came up to Christ Church, as the editor has ascertained, four months after Johnson entered at Pembroke,<sup>4</sup> was a person of higher type than these, but hardly worthy, except as an old associate, of the great privilege which has perpetuated his name. There is nothing beautiful in the figure of this burly squire-parson of conspicuously unclerical habits,<sup>5</sup> a landowner, a rector, and a canon of Westminster, active as a magistrate and liberal to the poor, but unfortunate in his married life, at variance now with his sister and now with his neighbours—'fierce and fell' in the prosecution of 'lawsuits,' and in one case contemplating what Johnson thought a *pactum iniquum*<sup>6</sup>; insatiably greedy of more Church preferment, 'as if he were in want with twenty children,'<sup>7</sup> disappointed (to the reader's satisfaction) in regard to deanery after deanery; giving way to 'unsettlement of mind' and 'unnecessary vexation'; exhibiting a childish imprudence in domestic affairs of special delicacy, and requiring the terse admonition to 'do his own business, and keep his own secrets';<sup>8</sup> a man whose talk, as Johnson himself said in the son of Sirach's words, was 'about bullocks,'<sup>9</sup> and was also curiously vulgar, as we gather from a bit of sly mimicry in one of Johnson's letters to Mrs. Thrale.<sup>10</sup> Johnson liked well enough to visit him in his 'very pleasant house at Ashbourne, where he had a lawn and a lake, and an abundance of live stock'—for instance, 'thirty deer that ate bread from the hand'—and where Boswell found 'everything good, no scantiness appearing, and a butler in purple clothes with a large white wig.'<sup>11</sup> The guest amused himself with the peculiarities of his host, but had a certain, though, as he frankly said,<sup>12</sup> a stationary

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, i. 198, 302.<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* i. 376, ii. 20; *Life*, ii. 463.<sup>3</sup> *Letters*, i. 304, 315.<sup>4</sup> *Johnson, his Friends and his Critics*, p. 343.<sup>5</sup> *Life*, iii. 181.<sup>6</sup> *Letters*, ii. 160; i. 400.<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* i. 396.<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* i. 109.<sup>9</sup> *Life*, iii. 181.<sup>10</sup> *Letters*, ii. 160.<sup>11</sup> *Life*, ii. 473.<sup>12</sup> See *Life*, iii. 181.

regard for him as representing old times. 'Neither of us,' he wrote in 1756, 'can now find many whom he has known so long as we have known each other.' Again, in 1775, 'Our friendship has lasted so long, that it is valuable for its antiquity.'<sup>1</sup> It seems to have been valuable for little else; yet still it was something to hold by, and at any rate we owe to sojourns at Ashbourne some of the best fun in the correspondence. The bucolic host was proud of his great bull, and Johnson humorously follows suit:

'Very great he is . . . he has no disease but age. I hope in time to be like the great bull. . . . There has been a man here to-day to take a farm. After some talk he went to see the bull, and said that he had seen a bigger. *Do you think he is likely to get the farm?* . . . Our bulls and cows are all well, but we yet hate the man that had seen a bigger bull.'<sup>2</sup>

All this was in a mild way diverting to Johnson, and was doubtless safer matter of talk at Ashbourne than some matters of graver interest, for Taylor was a Whig, and Johnson 'did not like much to see a Whig in any dress, but hated to see one in a parson's gown.'<sup>3</sup> One reminiscence of Ashbourne is significant: 'My time past heavily at Ashbourne; yet I could not easily get away, though Taylor, I sincerely think, was glad to see me go.'<sup>4</sup> This was in 1781. In 1782, after urging Taylor to take care of his health, and referring to his own distresses, mental and bodily, Johnson says: 'I wish that in our latter days we may give some comfort to each other; we have no time to lose in petulance.'<sup>5</sup>

Not long before Johnson's death he received from Taylor a letter which 'made him a little angry,' and which he answered with some peremptoriness. 'You mean to charge me with neglecting or opposing my own health. Tell me, therefore, what I do that hurts me, and what I neglect that would help me. . . . Answer the first part of this letter immediately.'<sup>6</sup>

One may speculate as to Taylor's feelings when, some two months later, he read the burial service over the friend whom in life he had not sufficient elevation to appreciate. As we have seen, he had embodied for Johnson the claims of an early intimacy; and we see its force also exhibited in re-

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, i. 71, 369; cf. ii. 267.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* i. 166, 178, 197. There are also references to a swan of Taylor's that had 'died without an elegy,' to a profusion of 'strawberries and cream,' of 'custard and bilberry pie,' and to Taylor's scheme of making a new garden, &c. (*ibid.* i. 181, 182, 346).

<sup>3</sup> *Life*, v. 255; referring to Granger's *Biographical Dictionary*. Taylor, however, seems to have been a moderate Whig (*Letters*, ii. 285).

<sup>4</sup> *Letters*, ii. 240.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 282.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 427.



ferences to his first love, Mrs. Careless, and in the correspondence with Mrs. Aston and Mrs. Gaskell, the sisters-in-law of that Gilbert Walmsley, Registrar of the Prerogative Court of Lichfield, who, although 'of advanced age when Johnson was only not a boy,' had shown him much kindly hospitality, and greatly enlarged the area of his knowledge.<sup>1</sup> This could never be forgotten; and therefore the two ladies at Stow-hill, to the east of Lichfield Cathedral, receive letters full of solicitude and sympathy, until at last, in the month before his death, he excuses himself for not having taken a formal farewell, 'which he hopes would have been no pleasure to them, and would have been painful to himself.'<sup>2</sup> We see, also, how strong a hold Lichfield always had upon his affections; he is well pleased with the accession of a new dean, whose 'spirit of discipline' will 'bring the cathedral into better method';<sup>3</sup> he complains of the corporation for 'cutting down the trees in George Lane';<sup>4</sup> he sketches for Mrs. Thrale's entertainment the constitution and the dissensions of an 'Amicable Society.'<sup>5</sup> He laughs gently at the conversational dullness. 'Mrs. Aston's parrot pecked my leg, and I heard of it some time after at Mrs. Cobb's';<sup>6</sup> *Evelina* was unheard of in the Lichfield 'reading society' until he mentioned it nearly four years after its publication.<sup>7</sup>

So much for what reminded him of his youth. But the larger portion of this correspondence is occupied with a friendship acquired when new friends were seldom made, and therefore 'something better than the general course of things gives man a right to expect'<sup>8</sup>—a friendship which, three years after its commencement, he 'counted among the felicities of life,'<sup>9</sup> and of which, some eight years later, he could say with a charming union of terseness and sweetness, 'I am sorry, not to owe so much, but to repay so little.'<sup>10</sup> He was fifty-five when he became acquainted, and rapidly intimate, with Henry and Hester Thrale, and, as Boswell expresses it, had an apartment appropriated 'to him, both in their house

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, i. 81.

<sup>2</sup> *Letters*, ii. 430. Compare *Letters*, i. 131; ii. 60, &c.

<sup>3</sup> *Letters*, ii. 24. Johnson regretted, and suppressed, a passage in his *Journey to the Western Islands* reflecting on a former dean's neglect of the cathedral fabric: 'from me it may be thought improper, for the dean did me a kindness about forty years ago. . . . Reproach can do him no good, and in myself I know not whether it is zeal or wantonness' (*ibid.* i. 300).

<sup>4</sup> *Letters*, i. 154. So in i. 162: 'I am not wholly unmoved by the revolutions in Sadler Street' (at the corner of which he had lived).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* i. 331.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* i. 335.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 234.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 47.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* i. 142.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* i. 388.

in Southwark and in their elegant villa at Streatham.<sup>1</sup> Two years later he begins to refer to it as that place which their kindness allowed him to call his home.<sup>2</sup> They appear under the titles of 'my master' and 'my mistress,' which it seems they respectively applied to each other. The little 'brisk, plump' lady, as Boswell describes her, with her superficial cleverness, and, one must add, her superficial affectionateness of speech and manner—often 'saucy,' always lively, habitually inaccurate in speech, much given to soft compliments or 'flatteries'<sup>3</sup>—was an element of brightness in Johnson's life which he found irresistible, and learned to prize as indispensable. We owe her much, for she did much for him: she stood between him and many dark clouds. In writing to her he becomes, so to speak, young again. He repays with interest her efforts to amuse him; he 'chaffs' her about her wig;<sup>4</sup> for her he chronicles, as we have seen, the daily trivialities of Ashbourne;<sup>5</sup> for her he adapts his stately 'Johnsonian' diction to the purposes of playful irony;<sup>6</sup> for her he records his Hebridean experiences, and sends her husband (a real scholar) a Sapphic ode to 'Thralia dulcis,' written while he was weatherbound in Skye;<sup>7</sup> for her he lightly touches on the weaknesses of his faithful fellow-traveller: 'Boswell, who is very pious, went into the chapel [on Inch Kenneth] at night to perform his devotions, but came back in haste for fear of spectres'; 'He carries with him two or three good resolutions; I hope they will not mould upon the road.'<sup>8</sup>

But Johnson's serious vein appears at frequent intervals. He expresses a keen interest in her husband's candidatures for Southwark; he gently lectures her on her want of methodical attention; he writes anxiously about her illnesses, and those of

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, i. 493; ii. 77.

<sup>2</sup> *Letters*, i. 129. A description of the house, 'unhappily swept away by the advance of London,' is given in a note. He identifies himself with the friendly brewer's family. 'The first consequence of *our* late trouble ought to be an endeavour to brew at a cheaper rate' (*ibid.* i. 194). Again in 1780: 'Having lost *our* election at Southwark' (*ibid.* ii. 203). Sophy Thrale is '*his* little girl' (*ibid.* ii. 359).

<sup>3</sup> 'If you love me,' he writes to her, 'and surely I hope you do, why should you vitiate my mind with a false opinion of its own merit?' (*ibid.* i. 221). So i. 329: 'Unusual compliments . . . embarrass the feeble . . . and disgust the wise;' and ii. 308: 'Do not flatter me.'

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 57: 'We will burn it and get drunk; for what is joy without drink? . . . Well, but seriously, I think I shall be glad to see you in your own hair.'

<sup>5</sup> Before a visit to Taylor in 1772 he asks Mrs. Thrale to 'write word how long I may have leave to stay' (*Letters*, i. 195).

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* i. 175, 352, 397; ii. 52, 138.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* i. 284.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* i. 281, 399.

her children ; professes himself a special partisan of one of the daughters ;<sup>1</sup> condoles tenderly with her on the death of her eldest boy in 1776 ;<sup>2</sup> and when, in April 1781, the father follows the son after hopeless depression and obscurity of mental faculties, Johnson can say nothing more significant of grief than that 'no death since that of his wife has ever oppressed him like' Mr. Thrale's.<sup>3</sup> Much earlier in their acquaintance his deep sympathy, ever responsive to the serious ills of humanity, though regardless of 'sentimental sorrows,' had watched the progress of the cancer which gradually devoured her mother's life. These two had not much liked each other ; Johnson had made a jest of Mrs. Salusbury's eager interest in foreign politics ; but the 'dreadful malady' of which '*de pis en pis* is the natural and certain course'<sup>4</sup> drew out his whole heart towards the 'poor dear lady,' who pressed his hand between both her own on the very day of her release.<sup>4</sup> Another consolatory letter is called forth by the very different trouble of a disappointment about a will which Mrs. Thrale had expected to be in her favour. 'The event is irrevocable. It remains only to bear it. . . . Be alone as little as you can. When you are alone, do not suffer your thoughts to dwell on what you *might* have done. . . . Even to think in the most reasonable manner is for the present not so useful as *not* to think.'<sup>5</sup>

Thrale was a strong man as well as a good one, and his removal set the wife who had never really loved him inopportunately free from the control which her temperament required.<sup>6</sup> A change set in which Johnson did not anticipate when, as one of the executors, he assisted her with practical sagacity, as well as with faithful regard, in the business matters which followed on Thrale's death. He thought highly, it seems, of her ability in this line. 'If you apply to business perhaps half the mind which you have exercised upon knowledge and

<sup>1</sup> 'I was always a Susy when nobody else was a Susy' (*ibid.* ii. 44) is not explained by the editor, but clearly refers to the old custom of hailing a leader or popular favourite—'A Monmouth!' &c.

<sup>2</sup> 'He is gone, and we are going. . . . He has probably escaped many such pangs as you are now feeling' (*ibid.* i. 381). He bids her resign herself to the 'Almighty goodness' of 'the Universal Father,' quoting Psalm xxx. 5, Matt. x. 29.

<sup>3</sup> *Letters*, ii. 209. Again he writes: 'I had interwoven myself with my dear friend. . . . I hope you gain ground on your affliction: I hope to overcome mine,' ii. 214.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* i. 195, 200, 211, 213, 217. She died June 18, 1773.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* i. 293.

<sup>6</sup> *Life*, iv. 277. 'Sir, she has done everything wrong since Thrale's bridle was off her neck' (May 16, 1784).

elegance, you will need little help.' <sup>1</sup> Some eight months after the death we find him mentioning a name that was to inflict a great shock on his life. All unconscious of what was approaching, he writes: 'Piozzi, I find, is coming, . . . and when *he* comes and *I* come, you will have two about you that love you.' <sup>2</sup> But a sort of prevision seems gradually to form itself. 'Pray contrive something that may hold all together. . . . Do not add to my other distresses any diminution of kindness for, madam, your,' &c. 'And *then*—what care you? what then? . . . Do not let Mr. Piozzi nor anybody else put me quite out of your head. . . . Keep up some kindness for me.' <sup>3</sup> These last sad words were written in June 1782. Mrs. Thrale soon resolved to quit Streatham. Johnson bade farewell, with solemn tenderness, to that dear familiar 'home.' He prayed that he 'might thankfully remember the comforts and conveniences which he had enjoyed there, and might resign them with holy submission,' and commended the family to the fatherly protection of God. <sup>4</sup> This was in October 1782. But he went with her to Brighton; they parted, with 'expostulations' on his side, in April 1783, when she went to Bath, where, as she herself writes, she 'knew he would not follow her.' <sup>5</sup> In the ensuing June he supposes that the narrative of his paralysis, 'which would once have affected' her 'with tenderness and sorrow, will now' be passed over

'with the careless glance of frigid indifference. For this diminution of regard, however, I know not whether I ought to blame you, who may have reasons which I cannot know. . . . You see I yet turn to you with my complaints as a settled and unalienable friend. Do not, do not drive me from you, for I have not deserved either neglect or hatred. . . . Think on me as on a man who for a very great portion of your life has done you all the good he could,' &c. <sup>6</sup>

The 'reason' was, that the woman of whom he had made so much, whom his admiring fondness had so generously overrated, had set her heart on a love match which she knew that he (in common with all her friends) would disapprove, and was wearied of what she afterwards called the 'yoke' of his presence and society. <sup>7</sup> She could not help it; she followed her shallow nature. She was willing to be kind to him in a cooler fashion; and when her thoughts were not

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, ii. 218. 'Elegance' with Johnson, as with Miss Austen, means refinement of manner and of mind (*Letters*, i. 292).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 238. But see below.

<sup>3</sup> *Life*, iv. 158.

<sup>4</sup> *Letters*, ii. 300, 303, 311.

<sup>5</sup> *Anecdotes*, p. 184; cf. *ibid.* pp. 60, 95.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 241, 243, 250, 259.

<sup>7</sup> *Anecdotes*, ed. Morley, p. 183.

absor  
not d  
friend  
which  
incre  
dread  
thing  
he w  
famil  
Soph  
and  
He is  
hope  
move  
and  
terror  
about  
stern  
story  
that  
wrote  
indig  
migh  
contr  
perha  
pathe  
recogn  
of a l  
T  
ence-  
We l  
unsou  
stran  
and  
detail  
his fa  
<sup>1</sup> A  
goodw  
love b  
<sup>2</sup> A  
<sup>3</sup> S  
and H  
Piozzi  
<sup>4</sup> A  
<sup>5</sup> A  
consti  
proach

absorbed by her new passion (which, it must be owned, was not dishonourable in itself) she was probably sorry for the old friend and former inmate, driven back into the loneliness from which her dead husband had once rescued him, and which the increase of infirmities and diseases would render yet more dreary and woeful. For his part he makes the most of anything like a revival of her former 'attention and tenderness':<sup>1</sup> he writes to 'dearest Miss Susy and Miss Sophy' in the familiar tone of a fatherly home friend. He rejoices when Sophy recovers from a threatening illness: 'God bless you and your children: so says, dear madam, your old friend.' He is trying to clasp a departing shadow; he hopes against hope; he tells her of his symptoms, and tries, as it were, to move her pity by such words as 'spiritless, infirm, sleepless, and solitary, looking back with sorrow and forward with terror—but I will stop.'<sup>2</sup> She could actually write to him about 'dying with a grace.' This was too much, and he sternly rebuked her flippant 'folly.'<sup>3</sup> One knows how the story must end. In June 1784 she gives him to understand that she has 'irrevocably' resolved to marry Piozzi.<sup>4</sup> He writes a letter, which Mr. Leslie Stephen calls a 'cry of blind indignation.' She remonstrates with more dignity than one might have expected. In his rejoinder he has recovered self-control, and 'breathes out one sigh more of tenderness, perhaps useless, but at least sincere.' There follow deeply pathetic words, which have often been quoted, in grateful recognition of her kindness, as having soothed 'twenty years of a life radically wretched.'<sup>5</sup>

There is a sad fascination in this summary of his experience—'a life radically wretched!' What is to be said of it? We know that, as he was clogged from the first with an unsound bodily constitution, exhibiting itself in scrofula, in strange nervous movements astonishing to casual observers, and in attacks of illness which crowd these *Letters* with details of suffering, so, as Boswell words it, he 'inherited from his father a vile melancholy,'<sup>6</sup> producing dark fits of hypo-

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, ii. 350. He adds: 'You will never bestow any share of your goodwill on one who deserves it better. Those that have loved longest love best.'

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 369.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 384.

<sup>4</sup> She was not in fact married until July 23. See note, *ibid.* ii. 404, and Hayward's *Mrs. Piozzi*. Her second letter speaks prematurely of Piozzi as her 'husband.'

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 407.

<sup>6</sup> *Life*, i. 35. 'That miserable dejection of spirits to which he was constitutionally subject' (*ibid.* i. 298). He often 'fancied himself approaching to insanity' (*ibid.* i. 66).

chondria, frequently 'operating against his health and his life with more or less violence,'<sup>1</sup> making him say on one occasion that he would consent to have a limb amputated to recover his spirits,<sup>2</sup> and on another that part of his life had been spent in gloomy discontent or importunate distress.<sup>3</sup> He could preach cheerfulness to others,<sup>4</sup> could exhort Taylor to avoid fretting, could say that it was 'useless and foolish, and perhaps sinful, to be gloomy,'<sup>5</sup> but he could not consistently act on his own teaching. Add to this his frequent illnesses, and especially that burden of 'wearisome nights,' caused by dyspepsia or by asthma, which is so often referred to in these *Letters*,<sup>6</sup> and we understand his craving for club society, his horror of solitude, his frequent postponement of bedtime, his bursts of irritability, his impatience of contradiction. If people could have looked into his mind they would have judged his 'rudeness' more equitably. And the shadows darkened, the waters became more turbid, when he thought of 'the inevitable hour.' He once said that he had never had a moment when the thought of death was not terrible to him.<sup>7</sup> And here comes in a question of painful interest. He was a convinced and earnest Christian. Why, it may be asked, did not his Christianity deliver him from this fear, which a sacred writer would have called his 'bondage'? Nay, did it not rather intensify the infliction? He more than once explained himself on the subject from a distinctly religious point of view. 'No man could be sure that his repentance and obedience had been such' as to satisfy 'the terms on which the mediation of our Saviour was promised.'<sup>8</sup> 'The Redeemer Himself,' he once said with 'gloomy agitation' at Oxford, 'had declared that He would set some on His left hand;'<sup>9</sup> or again, 'goodness, always wishing to be better, never dares to suppose the condition of forgiveness fulfilled.'<sup>10</sup> It is language like this apparently which has led Dr. Hill to say that Cowper's mind 'took a deeper gloom from religion than even Johnson's.'<sup>11</sup> But is this a satisfactory account of the matter? Johnson repeatedly made resolutions to give more time to definitely religious exercises—to read the Bible more regularly, to form a habit of attending Church service. Once he said, 'Whenever I miss church on a Sunday, I resolve

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, i. 69.<sup>2</sup> *Life*, i. 483.<sup>3</sup> *Letters*, i. 250.<sup>4</sup> *E.g.* to Thrale, after his son's death had broken him down (*Letters*, ii. 99). Thrale came to him 'for comfort' on Good Friday.<sup>5</sup> *Life*, iv. 142.<sup>6</sup> *Letters*, i. 205; ii. 25, 373, &c.<sup>7</sup> *Life*, iii. 153, 295; iv. 261, 289. See also *Letters*, ii. 133, 231.<sup>8</sup> *Life*, iii. 294.<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* iv. 300.<sup>10</sup> *Letters*, ii. 380.<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 385.

to go  
time  
his i  
to it  
and  
be e  
lived  
assoc  
stead  
ticip  
mun  
had  
Divi  
have  
last  
illne  
sudd  
to h  
drop  
As  
drea  
pass  
an  
trem  
Char  
to T  
irrel  
a sch

1  
2  
3

prepa  
cates  
Euch

part  
7

are c  
(Life)  
my h

8  
9

have  
(ii. 28)

10  
1783  
dying

11  
12



to go another day, but I do not always do it.' Again, 'I hope in time to take pleasure in public worship.'<sup>1</sup> Indolence was one of his interior troubles; in his surveys of past years he ascribes to it the failures of which he is conscious. 'I have been idle, and of idleness comes no goodness,'<sup>2</sup> is a confession which may be exaggerated, but which explains such language as 'I have lived a life of which I do not like the review.'<sup>3</sup> He once associates indolence with 'indifference.'<sup>4</sup> If he had made steadier efforts to conquer these hindrances in regard to participation in public worship, and, especially, if he had communicated more frequently than at Easter,<sup>5</sup> he would not have had merely occasional 'radiations of comfort' in the course of Divine service;<sup>6</sup> the means of grace, habitually used, would have been for him means of 'a strong consolation.'<sup>7</sup> In the last year of his life, 1784, the 'terrors' diminished; during an illness in February he gave a whole day to devotion, and 'on a sudden obtained extraordinary relief, for which he looked up to heaven' with thankfulness.<sup>8</sup> The phrase 'eternal mercy' drops more than once from his pen as the end draws nearer.<sup>9</sup> As Macaulay expresses it, 'when at length the moment dreaded through so many years came close, the dark cloud passed away from Johnson's mind.'<sup>10</sup> That same relief from an 'overwhelming dread' which was granted in their extremity to the Abbess Angélique, to Maria Theresa, and to Charles Wesley, was not withheld from him, who, according to Thackeray's estimate, had 'shamed the nation out of irreligion.'<sup>11</sup> George Strahan, the vicar of Islington (who as a schoolboy at Abingdon, as a freshman at Oxford,<sup>12</sup> and in

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, iii. 401; ii. 214.

<sup>2</sup> *Letters*, ii. 187.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* i. 216; cf. i. 250.

<sup>4</sup> *Life*, ii. 143.

<sup>5</sup> On his peculiar 'placidity' on Easter Day see *Life*, iii. 25. On his preparation for Communion, iii. 99; iv. 122. In *Letters*, ii. 204, he deprecates the view that 'St. John vi. was to be *primarily* interpreted of the Eucharist.'

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* iii. 25. He was on this occasion so much moved by the second part of the *Gloria in Excelsis* that he 'could not utter it.'

<sup>7</sup> 'We find his devotions in this year (1777) eminently fervent; and we are comforted by observing intervals of quiet, composure, and gladness' (*Life*, iii. 99). At the Easter service, he says, 'As my heart grew lighter my hopes revived.' On Holy Week see the *Idler*, No. 103.

<sup>8</sup> *Life*, iv. 272.

<sup>9</sup> *Letters*, ii. 327, 335. So, earlier: 'I hope the happiness which I have not found in this world will by infinite mercy be granted in another' (ii. 281).

<sup>10</sup> *Biographical Essay on Johnson*. He died December 13, 1784. In 1783 he had written, 'I hope I shall learn to die as dear Williams is dying . . . with calmness and hope' (*Letters*, ii. 327).

<sup>11</sup> *The Four Georges*.

<sup>12</sup> His father, William Strahan, had printed the *Dictionary*. Johnson

later life under a painful domestic difficulty,<sup>1</sup> had experienced Johnson's considerate and steadfast kindness), had the privilege of ministering to him on his deathbed, and testified that 'his foreboding dread of the Divine justice by degrees subsided into a pious trust and humble hope in the Divine mercy.'<sup>2</sup> Three years before he had written out for Boswell an argument for the vicariousness of the Atonement, as a 'satisfaction of God's justice by Christ's death';<sup>3</sup> he now as a dying man exhorted his kind physician, who seems to have been somewhat sceptical, to believe in 'the propitiatory sacrifice of Jesus, as necessary, beyond all good works whatever, for the salvation of mankind.'<sup>4</sup> In his last will he bequeathed to God 'a soul polluted by many sins, but, I hope, purified by Jesus Christ'; and before his last Communion he prayed: 'Grant that my whole hope and confidence may be in His merits and in Thy mercy. . . . Make the death of Thy Son effectual to my redemption,' &c.

Here, then, it was precisely Johnson's religion, when allowed to exercise its full legitimate power, and to flood his soul with an adequate perception of the love of God in Christ, which triumphed at last over his lifelong melancholy, and brightened his deathbed with the peace which would otherwise have been lacking.<sup>5</sup> Had this benign power been habitually and thoroughly recognized in his life; had he treated the faith which he firmly held as given not less to cheer than to overawe; had he thus taken Christianity at its own word, and resorted oftener to its ordinances as remedies for anxiety and 'points of contact' with Him who 'is our Peace,' how much unhappiness would he have avoided! On the other hand, imagine a man of Johnson's temperament passing out of the world without prayer and faith, and what blackness of darkness would have enveloped such a scene!

Boswell has admirably said that 'in no writings whatever can be found more bark and steel for the mind than' in John-

writes to George as a pupil of Henry Bright, the master of Abingdon School, urging him to take pains about writing Latin, and assuring him that if he had not answered his letters it was from no diminution of regard. 'I love you,' he says to the sensitive lad, 'and hope to love you long.' In 1764 he secured George's election as a scholar of University College. 'The college is almost filled with my friends, and he will be well treated' (*Letters*, i. 95-97, 100, 113).

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, ii. 267, 272, 283. He reproves George for 'discontent.'

<sup>2</sup> *Life*, iv. 416.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* iv. 124.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* iv. 416. Like Scott, he loved the *Dies Ira*; and could not repeat the stanza ending *Tantus labor non sit cassus* without bursting into tears. *Anecdotes*, p. 131.

<sup>5</sup> On the tranquillising effect of prayer see *Letters*, i. 382.

son's.<sup>1</sup> This tonic quality appears in his *Letters*. Take a few specimens only. 'What is modesty,' i.e. self-depreciation, 'if it deserts from truth?'<sup>2</sup> 'We can hardly be confident of the state of our own minds, but as it stands attested by some external action; we are seldom sure that we sincerely meant what we omitted to do.'<sup>3</sup> 'All pleasure preconceived and preconcerted ends in disappointment.'<sup>4</sup> 'All unnecessary vows are folly, because they suppose a prescience of the future which has not been given us.'<sup>5</sup> 'He must mingle with the world that desires to be useful.'<sup>6</sup> 'Nor is there any semblance of kindness more vigorously to be repelled than that which voluntarily offers' (to an elderly man) 'a vicarious performance of the duties of life, and conspires with the natural love of ease against diligence and perseverance.'<sup>7</sup> 'Sadness only multiplies self.'<sup>8</sup> 'Whoever lives heedlessly lives in a mist.'<sup>9</sup> 'Praise and money, the two powerful corrupters of mankind.'<sup>10</sup> 'Incommunicative taciturnity . . . reposes on a stubborn sufficiency self-centered.'<sup>11</sup> 'Take all the opportunities of learning that offer themselves, however remote the matter may be from common life,' &c.<sup>12</sup> 'Vain and idle discontent' is finely described as '*corroding*' the character.<sup>13</sup> 'Though effects are not always in our power, yet Providence always gives us something to do.'<sup>14</sup> There are sayings also which concentrate a mass of religious wisdom as brought to bear on the expectation or the reality of bereavement: 'There is always this consolation, that we have our Protector, who can never be lost but by our own fault.' 'Let us resign her with confidence into the hands of Him who knows, and who only knows, what is best both for her and for us;' 'Turn your thoughts to Him who gives and takes away, in whose presence the living and dead are standing together.'<sup>15</sup> Other *consolatoria* in the same tone have already been quoted.

These are the golden words of a great teacher, whose infirmities of temperament, or old-world prejudices, or practical inconsistencies, can never impair his right to our love and honour; and those who by aid of these *Letters* have renewed their intimacy with the subject of the *Life*, will probably, on their next visit to the royal Abbey church, turn aside with a

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, i. 215.<sup>2</sup> *Letters*, i. 35.<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* i. 353.<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* i. 339.<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* i. 217. The context of this weighty sentence is worth pondering.<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* i. 337.<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* i. 401.<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 102.<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 344.<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 345.<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 356.<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 386.<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* i. 208.<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.* i. 383.<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.* i. 139, 212, 294.

sense of relief from some monuments, and some memories too little in accord with a great sanctuary of Christian worship, and stand with thankful reverence beside the large blue stone in the south transept,<sup>1</sup> which covers the sacred dust of Samuel Johnson.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The brief inscription was recut by Dean Bradley's order in 1884, the centenary year of Johnson's death.

<sup>2</sup> Something should here perhaps be added as to Mrs. Thrale's letters to Johnson, included in the correspondence which she published as Mrs. Piozzi in 1788. His own letters, reproduced by Dr. Hill, are in some cases hardly so intelligible as the reader might wish in default of those to which they are replies. There is indeed reason to think that, with her lax notions about accuracy, she took strange liberties with the text of her own letters; Dr. Hill says plainly that she even 'fabricated' some, and did it clumsily too. And in two instances at least she presented as part of Johnson's letters language of a highly suspicious kind, in regard to Boswell and to Piozzi (i. 330; ii. 239). Yet she asserts in her preface that Johnson's letters 'remain just as he wrote them'; although she does not include the passionate outburst beginning, 'If I interpret your letter aright, you are ignominiously married.' Much that appears as hers, and is referred to by Boswell (*Life*, iii. 421) as 'well written and studied,' is not for that reason to be set aside as composed by her for the purpose of her publication. If she had merely amused him with smart pleasantries and lively banter, with what in one passage she calls 'vagabonding nonsense' (*Piozzi Letters*, ii. 89, and again, 'Is not this nonsense enough?' *ibid.* ii. 234), he would not have admired her as he did, or valued, as he did, his opportunities of converse with her, epistolary or colloquial. One is astonished, as it is, to find him saying, 'I long thought you the first of womankind' (*Letters*, ii. 406); but such an expression would have been worse than hyperbolic if she had not, in letters as in talk, given evidence of some intellectual power, of some literary culture, of some shrewdness and some good sense. And what she printed as her part in the correspondence does contain such indications, together with a good deal that illustrates her apprehension of being thought 'pedantic' (*Piozzi Letters*, i. 390, ii. 147), and that reads like a feminine variation of 'Johnsonese.' Her references to ancient authors like Herodotus, her quotation of such a passage as 'Grata superveniet quæ non sperabitur hora' (*ibid.* i. 327), her frequent allusions to modern literature, English or continental, are likely enough to have been really addressed to such a correspondent. She several times replies to his charge of 'flattery'; and once she silyly remarks that Mr. Thrale had recently found Johnson 'amid a heap of men, all flattering away à qui mieux mieux' (i. 91). In one passage she says, 'I know your horror of presumption, and your idea that the fearing Christian is most in the favour of Heaven; but recollect that Honest and Hopeful got over the river better than Christian and Muchafraid in the *Pilgrim's Progress*' (i. 193)—a specimen of confused and inaccurate reference which might easily drop from a facile pen in a genuine letter. She frankly owns that she married Thrale to please her uncle, and that 'our generous master doubtless married' her 'with hopes and promises of the Hertfordshire estate,' which, after all, her uncle's will disposed of otherwise. Her language about Thrale is that of esteem, but not of affection, and thus represents the fact. One is glad to accept as genuine her defence of 'a pious, charitable, peaceful, Christian' woman, called a 'Methodist' by way of 'reproach' (ii. 119), and her remark on the Good

## ART. III.—MR. HERBERT SPENCER ON JUSTICE.

*Justice: being Part IV. of the 'Principles of Ethics.'* By  
HERBERT SPENCER. (London, 1891.)

A NEW philosophical work by Mr. Herbert Spencer must always be received with interest, even by those who, like ourselves, do not accept the doctrine which he has been so long and so earnestly preaching to the world. He is the clearest and most intelligible of all our philosophical writers; he rivals even Dr. Martineau in his power of making abstruse thought attractive and easy to the ordinary reader; and the addition of another story, or even of a portion of another story, to the great

Friday of 1783, when one daughter had died, and another seemed to be dying, 'No Christian ought to complain of hard sufferings on this anniversary of harder suffering inflicted on his Saviour himself' (ii. 254). Months later, when another daughter ('Sophy') is recovering, Mrs. Thrale replies to Johnson's expressed disquietude as to the diminution of her regard by saying, with what looks like the forced warmth which is really coldness, that he must not think her 'wanting in goodwill towards him, of whom no person living can think more highly' (ii. 338, November 1783). One sees, also, what might partly explain her eager grasping at the hope of a happier married life, in words of an earlier date which show that what she calls her 'flashiness,' her exuberance of talk, her brilliant vivacity, was the mask of trouble caused by anxiety or grief about her children, or want of satisfaction in her home: 'If ever I get quiet I shall be happy, and if I get happy I shall have a chance to get wise' (i. 303). Mr. Hayward, her advocate, who thinks Johnson a man of 'coarse' grain, frankly exhibits the girlishness of her passion (*æt.* 42) for her 'lovely Piozzi,' and the smallness of her nature as indicated in the journal entry that Johnson's friendship for her was 'merely interested, that he cared only for her dinners and her nursing'—although he urges that much stress should not be laid on such an 'ebullition of mortified self-love' (*Mrs. Piozzi*, i. 171). We may add that the repulsive passage in her *Anecdotes*, above referred to, about the 'yoke' of Johnson's presence as an inmate at first 'terrifying' and afterwards 'irksome,' although felt as a great 'honour,' should in fairness be read along with others in which she testifies to his 'tenderness, gratitude, refined sensibility'—to his remarkable independence of personal 'attendance'—to the 'beneficence which during his life increased the comforts of so many'—to the 'energy' of his 'devotion, which affected all who ever saw him pray in private,' and 'animated' all who heard him 'read the Holy Scriptures.' 'When I search for shadow to my portrait, none can I find but what was formed by pride... yet never was pride so purified as Johnson's at once from meanness and from vanity.' His 'roughness' of manner caused 'his character to be grossly and frequently mistaken.' We add one sentence more, which might plead for an equitable judgment as to the foibles and faults of Hester Thrale or Piozzi: 'I should as much have expected injustice from Socrates, or impiety from Pascal, as the slightest deviation from truth and goodness in any transaction one might be engaged in with Samuel Johnson.'

VOL. XXXIV.—NO. LXVIII.

Y

edifice which he has devoted his life to construct commands the respect, if not the assent, of all who value singleheartedness and perseverance and steadfastness of purpose. The great scheme of the 'Synthetic Philosophy,' announced in 1860, which was to bring the whole range of existence, organic and inorganic, and every department of life and thought, beneath the grasp of a single uniform system, is not indeed completed, and, in face of what Mr. Spencer has now for some years past hinted in his prefaces concerning failing health and ability to work, may never be quite completed; but another section has been added to it by the appearance of the volume before us. The *Principles of Ethics* is the final and crowning portion of Mr. Spencer's philosophical scheme. The first part of it appeared thirteen years ago under the title of the *Data of Ethics*, and has long since taken its place as a standard representative of one side of modern thought. The second part, Mr. Spencer informs us in his Preface, will deal with the 'Inductions of Ethics,' and the third with the 'Ethics of Individual Life'; but these, though apparently in an advanced state of preparation, have been postponed to Part IV., which opens the discussion of the 'Ethics of Social Life' by dealing with the fundamental virtue of 'Justice.' The whole scheme will be completed, if life and strength permit, by two other sections on social life, the first treating of 'Negative Beneficence' and the last of 'Positive Beneficence.' One cannot better begin an examination of the part now before us than by expressing the hope that the remaining sections may follow in due course, and the whole work be brought to its honourable conclusion.

No volume by Mr. Spencer would fulfil expectations if it did not contain certain vagaries, in the way both of omission and of commission; but it may safely be said that there is in the present volume less than usual that will arouse the hostility of those who refuse to accept his fundamental principles, and consequently are habitually opposed to him. Mr. Spencer no doubt still refers to our occasional little wars and expeditions as though they were due to an inhuman pleasure in the slaughter of unoffending savages; but he has almost forgotten to gird at the ministers of the Christian religion, whom, like many less intelligent opponents of Christianity, he prefers to call 'priests,' as though it were a term of reproach. There is the same adroit marshalling of effective analogies from the animal creation, with the same ignoring of the full conclusions suggested by such analogies. There is the same sublime indifference to, or want of acquaintance with, the systems of

thin  
one  
wron  
the g  
and  
tion  
virtu  
it sh  
those  
or in  
justic  
sever  
satisf  
ally  
the t  
over,  
the S  
force,  
frequ  
variet  
More  
of M  
of Jus  
profit  
be dr  
princi  
tion o  
the m  
defini  
yet su  
to a  
most  
TH  
adher  
almost  
widely  
to cov  
quite,  
sophy,  
Mr. Sp  
at whi  
shall s  
to do t



thinkers who belong to a different school from his own. In one passage<sup>1</sup> the conceptions of Aristotle as to right and wrong in social affairs are expressly rejected as worthless, on the ground that he regarded slavery as a normal institution, and so excluded all the working classes from his consideration; as though it were not possible for the conception of a virtue to be sound in principle, although the sphere in which it should operate has been greatly extended. To Kant and those who have followed in his footsteps, whether in England or in Germany, Mr. Spencer seems persistently unable to do justice; but this failing affects the present volume less than several of its predecessors, and it may be admitted, with satisfaction rather than in blame, that Mr. Spencer is habitually less interested in polemic than in construction. And if the testimony of Aristotle and Butler and Kant is passed over, the Fijians and the Dyaks, the Abors and the Lepchas, the Shirry-dikas and the War-are-aree-kas are here in full force, and illustrations from rooks and beavers, though less frequent than in the *Data of Ethics*, are yet sufficient to give variety and attractiveness to the discussion of moral problems. More important than this, it is possible even for an opponent of Mr. Spencer's philosophy to accept the general definition of Justice from which he starts, and consequently to join with profit in the discussion of the various deductions which may be drawn from it. The fallacy, as it seems to us, of the principle which underlies the whole of Mr. Spencer's application of the Evolution philosophy to Ethics may indeed vitiate the method by which he arrives at this definition; but the definition itself, whether accepted as fully adequate or not, is yet substantially sound, and the deductions from it give rise to a series of most interesting reflections on many of the most important social and political questions of the day.

The definition of Justice has given more trouble to the adherents of the various philosophical schools than that of almost any of the other virtues; and the term is, indeed, so widely employed that it is almost impossible for one definition to cover all its applications. It is curious that almost, if not quite, the earliest definition recorded in the history of philosophy, by one of those ancients towards whose testimony Mr. Spencer is so contemptuous, is almost identical with that at which Mr. Spencer himself arrives. Mr. Spencer, as we shall see shortly, defines Justice as the freedom of every man to do that which he wills, provided he infringes not the equal

<sup>1</sup> *Justice*, p. 219.

freedom of any other man. The definition of Justice is the avowed object of the great Platonic dialogue of the *Republic*, and the formula arrived is that Justice consists in every man minding his own business and not interfering with that of his fellows.<sup>1</sup> It is true that the social structure which Plato builds upon this foundation would not at all commend itself to the views of Mr. Spencer; but the coincidence of formulas is instructive. Aristotle, who, *pace* Mr. Spencer, has not unfrequently anticipated the best thought of modern times, fails us somewhat here; for the book of the *Ethics* containing the discussion on Justice is one of those in which the Aristotelian treatment is most obscured by the manner of its transmission. Still, the main definition of Justice in its wider sense, as identical with virtue, viewed not absolutely but in its relation to others,<sup>2</sup> is probably genuinely Aristotelian, and shows a clear and penetrating insight into its nature. At the present day it would, however, be felt to be inadequate. Justice is not now regarded as the end and sum of man's duty to his neighbour. It is part of that duty, the irreducible minimum of its claim, but it is not the whole. The conception of that duty has enlarged; and a Christian need not hesitate to say what has been at least a principal influence in that enlargement. Aristotle's wider definition of Justice is consequently too wide, and on the other hand his narrower definition of it, in its two spheres of Corrective and Distributive Justice, is too narrow. It is too purely legal and administrative. Law should be guided by Justice, but it is not the whole of it; and we require a fuller examination of what Justice *is*, apart from the concrete forms in which it is embodied.

When Plato and Aristotle fail, one may pass at once to the modern world, and to the last two centuries or, at the most, three. Here the divergence between the two great streams of modern thought is at least as obvious in relation to the virtue of Justice as elsewhere. The intuitionist refers its paramount claim to an intuition which is part and parcel of man's nature; the hedonist (and for practical purposes one need only speak of the utilitarian, since egotistic hedonism is, as a philosophical creed, extinct) explains it as merely embodying the practical experiences of mankind as to what is convenient and pleasurable in the intercourse of man with man. Mill perpetrates one of those strange violations of logic which seem to pursue, like a Nemesis, the author of a *System of Logic*, when he derives the idea of Justice from legal

<sup>1</sup> *Republic*, iv. 10.

<sup>2</sup> *Nicomachean Ethics*, v. 1.

restraint, and in the same breath declares that laws may be unjust.<sup>1</sup> But he regards the notion of expediency and utility as entering largely into the sentiment of Justice, and so giving it its moral character; and in this he has the concurrence of Sidgwick. Professor Sidgwick, with that talent for analysis and dissection which makes him so much more effective in criticism than in construction, rejects the intuitionist explanation of Justice as failing to account for all its multiform developments in detail, and these he considers to be explicable only if admitted to rest on a Utilitarian basis.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Spencer agrees wholly with neither of these views; but while for the most part he simply ignores the intuitionist or *à priori* position, he takes pains to repudiate specifically the doctrine of the Utilitarians. He points out,<sup>3</sup> with perfect justice, what the opponents of universalistic hedonism have repeatedly pointed out before, that Utilitarianism rests on two large and fundamental intuitions, to which it is impossible to assign an origin in experience: first, the intuition that the greatest happiness of the greatest number is the proper goal of human endeavour; and next, the intuition that everybody is to count for one, and nobody for more than one, or that every man has an equal right to happiness. Neither of these propositions can be inductively proved; they must rest (as Mr. Sidgwick himself admits) on an *à priori* intuition.

What, then, is Mr. Spencer's own account of the origin of the sentiment of Justice? It rests on the principle, familiar to all students of his philosophy, that an idea can be *à priori* to the individual, but *à posteriori* to the race. Man, in the far distant past through which the species has developed, learnt the utility of justice, and the lessons which he learnt became, by inheritance, part of the mental furniture with which his descendants enter upon life to-day. It is a simple theory and a plausible one, seeming to reconcile the intuitionist and the utilitarian views, but it can hardly be held to be sound. If it is impossible, as Mr. Spencer holds, for man to-day to arrive by experience at the two principles which form the foundation of Utilitarianism, how was it more possible for primeval man to do so? It must be admitted, says Mr. Spencer,<sup>4</sup> that the truth that two straight lines cannot enclose a space cannot be established *à posteriori*, 'since not in one case, still less in many cases, can lines be pursued out into infinity for the purpose of observing what

<sup>1</sup> *Utilitarianism*, pp. 70-72.

<sup>2</sup> *Methods of Ethics*, 2nd ed., pp. 234-264, 407-414.

<sup>3</sup> *Justice*, pp. 57-60.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 55.

happens to the space between them ;' but surely it must equally be admitted that infinity can no more be reached by many generations of men than by one, and that the stored and accumulated experience of the race can no more reach that goal than a single man. You cannot make an *à priori* idea by referring it to *à posteriori* experience in a past, however distant, while you admit that such experience is totally incompetent to produce such an idea in the present. Moreover, there is a difference in kind between the *à priori* ideas, which are the basis of all our experience and moral being, and ideas of experience, however universal. The sun has risen in the east and set in the west ever since man was upon the earth ; but all this accumulated experience has not given that idea the character of inevitableness and necessity which is possessed by the ideas of causality or of duty.

But if the utilitarian explanation is inadequate to provide an ultimate basis for the idea of Justice, and the evolutionary explanation is only a variant of the utilitarian, there remains the intuitionist point of view. According to this, the ultimate formula of Justice, as of the other virtues, rests upon an *à priori* intuition, though the filling of it in practical detail varies according to differences in the age and circumstances. It is here that the value of the utilitarian idea comes in, for it is often difficult to regulate the practical application of an ethical formula except by reference to the data accumulated by experience. This is particularly the case with such a virtue as Justice, which is largely concerned with the external actions of men. There are many virtues which are valuable only when they exist in the internal motive or spring of action, and whose worth is not dependent upon their being expressed in outward activity ; but Justice is a virtue of which the external expression must be enforced, even if the inward spring be wanting. It is of importance to force the thief or the swindler to refrain from violating justice, even if he has no love of justice in his heart. Hence the maxims of justice are largely concerned with external actions, in reference to which it is necessary to be guided by utilitarian considerations. This is true to a great extent of the idea of justice in private life ; but it is exclusively true in that large sphere of it which is represented by the administration of law. Law can only take cognizance of external actions, not of internal motives ; and hence the application of utilitarian criteria to practical legislation by Bentham is universally admitted, even by intuitionists, to be of the greatest value. The same explanation will meet most difficulties raised by Mr. Sidgwick. We require the aid of

the ut  
concr  
from

It  
Justic  
for it  
sourc  
terms  
spher  
but o  
differ  
press  
virtue  
tribue  
perso  
every  
titles  
defin  
neare  
that  
to rep  
with  
sons  
huma  
and r  
Justic  
want  
a too  
bette  
differ

M  
expro  
quote  
wills,  
other  
term  
own  
are i  
whic  
betw  
in th  
whic

the utilitarian standard to apply the principle of Justice to concrete cases ; but the principle itself derives its authority from an internal intuition.

It follows, then, to ask, what *is* the ultimate formula of Justice? And here we begin to approach common ground ; for it is quite possible for people who differ radically as to the source of a formula's authority to agree completely as to the terms of the formula itself. Indeed, throughout the whole sphere of morals it is not on the content of the various virtues, but on the explanation of their source, that the rival schools differ. The definition of Justice given by Roman law expresses as nearly as may be the general conception of that virtue : ' *justitia est constans et perpetua voluntas suum cuique tribuendi.*' Dr. Martineau<sup>1</sup> defines it as 'the treatment of persons according to their deserts ;' Aristotle, as assigning to every person that share of good or evil to which his merit entitles him ; and Mr. Sidgwick, though dissatisfied with all definitions, thinks that the principle of requiring desert comes nearer to our ideal than any other view. Mill's explanation, that 'the sentiment of justice appears to be the animal desire to repel or retaliate a hurt or damage to oneself, or to those with whom one sympathises, widened so as to include all persons by the human capacity of enlarged sympathy and the human conception of intelligent self-interest,'<sup>2</sup> is inadequate, and represents too exclusively the purely police view of justice. Justice includes rendering good to people, as well as evil. We want a higher ideal, a wider formula, than 'an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.' The Latin motto, *Suum cuique*, suits better, though the content of what is recognized as *suum* will differ widely from age to age.

Mr. Spencer's definition is akin to that just given, but it expresses it from a slightly different point of view. As already quoted, it runs thus : 'Every man is free to do that which he wills, provided that he infringe not the equal freedom of any other man,'<sup>3</sup> or, as it is elsewhere expressed in more general terms, 'each adult individual shall take the consequences of its own nature and actions.' The two root notions of this definition are impartiality and freedom, and they are the elements out of which any satisfactory definition must be made. The difference between individual thinkers is not so much in the idea itself as in the side from which they approach it. Kant, in the formula which is one of his embodiments of the fundamental law of

<sup>1</sup> *Types of Ethical Theory*, 2nd ed. vol. ii. p. 249.

<sup>2</sup> *Utilitarianism*, p. 79.

<sup>3</sup> *Justice*, p. 46.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 60.

virtue—'Act so as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in that of another, as an end, never as a means only'<sup>1</sup>—dwells rather on the aspect of impartiality. Aristotle, the Pandects, and Dr. Martineau look at it as implying a distribution, in which these principles have to be observed. Plato brings out the element of non-interference with others; and Mr. Spencer, developing this view to its fullest extent, regards Justice as mainly an aspect of freedom. It is good and suggestive to dwell on any of the various aspects of this fundamental social virtue, and the aspect adopted by Mr. Spencer is not the least good and suggestive of them all.

As is naturally to be expected in any work of Mr. Spencer's, the formula which he adopts requires to be associated with and derived from the fundamental law which regulates the whole course and system of the universe. That law is the law of Evolution, which is embodied in the phrase 'the survival of the fittest.' That the fittest may survive, all that is necessary is that the law of natural causation should have free course. Therefore everyone must experience the natural consequences of his own actions, and to this end it is essential that there should be no external interference to disturb this sequence. Each individual must be free to act as he wills, and to take the consequences. Only, since man is a gregarious animal, the proviso must be inserted that such restraint is admissible and necessary as may prevent one individual, in the exercise of his own liberty, interfering with others who have an equal right to independence. Hence the formula which has been already quoted. The only comment that need be made here is one which applies equally to most of the evolutionary ethics: namely, that the full logical development of the principle of Evolution would require that all men should be left absolutely unfettered, and that if a man cannot secure himself against interference he is clearly less fit to survive than his neighbour who can do so, and should be required to take a lower place accordingly. This difficulty is apparent as soon as we come to the first deduction which Mr. Spencer draws from his formula, the self-evident corollary, as he calls it, of the right to physical integrity—the right, that is, to protection against injury to life or limb. Such a right is not only wholly unknown to all the grades of existence below man, it is also directly contrary to the principle to which they owe their evolution. The fittest have survived, just because the less fit were not allowed any 'right to physical integrity.' Why

<sup>1</sup> *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals* (Abbott), 2nd ed. p. 47.



should not man also be left to work out his own salvation—not moral, in this case, but physical? If it be said that the standard is changed when we reach the level of man, and that physical life is not the highest object of man's being, the fact may be granted, but not upon any ground open to the pure evolutionist. The law of Evolution is enunciated in terms of life, and there is no warrant for introducing a new standard, whether happiness or any other, when it comes to deal with man. Let the fittest survive, and let them show their fitness by surviving when all restraints are removed.

The paradox thus arrived at arises from the confusion between 'life' and 'happiness,' as the essential element in the human ideal, which lies at the root of Mr. Spencer's ethical theory; but the discussion of it belongs rather to a review of his earlier volume, the *Data of Ethics*, than of that now in question. Instead of going over the old ground again it would perhaps be more profitable to accept the formula of Justice which Mr. Spencer has given, though without accepting his method of arriving at it, and to consider the practical deductions which he proceeds to make from it. These are full of interest, and touch at many points the vexed questions of to-day in the department of social science.

First, there are a number of deductions in respect to the principles of which there will be little dispute, and most of which are now embodied in law. These relate to the rights to 'physical integrity,' to free motion and locomotion, to the uses of natural media, such as air, light, water—land being reserved for separate discussion—the right to property, to incorporeal property (viz. mental products and good reputation), the right of gift and bequest, of free exchange and contract, of free belief and worship, of free speech and publication. All of these have been at different times the subjects of bitter dispute, some of them (notably the right to property, and, above all, landed property) are so now; but the general principle of each is admitted by almost everyone, and is formally accepted and safeguarded by the State. The progress of civilization has been a progress in the acceptance of these ideas, in widening the sphere within which each of them is recognized as valid, and in the incorporation of them into the laws of the community. On the whole Mr. Spencer appears in the somewhat unusual character of the sound conservative, recognizing existing institutions as on the whole admirable, and deprecating change, although not a few persons would regard the changes which he deprecates as further steps along the road of justice on which civilization has been consistently,

but slowly, progressing. On one or two of these questions it may be permissible to say a few words before passing on to the important and most debateable part of the treatise, which deals with the nature and duties of the State.

The question of the right to private ownership of land arises out of the right of every individual to the natural media which make life possible. It is admitted, alike by the common sentiment of justice and by law, that no one may be deprived by another of light and air. Land is not less necessary to existence than these other elements. It is the universal postulate of all life and all wealth, and it appears to follow naturally that every person has a right to the use of the land, and no one has a right to more. Theoretically the socialist principle seems inassailable. But the socialist application of the principle is quite another matter, and Mr. Spencer adds a special appendix, in which he deals with the idea that the community has a right to resume the ownership of the land without compensation. He rightly disposes of the argument that the ancestors of the present holders of the land obtained it by force or fraud, and that therefore their descendants may be dispossessed of it without compensation; for although private ownership undoubtedly originated mainly in conquest, the landless of to-day are quite as much the descendants of the original conquerors as the landed, and the landed, not less than the landless, are the descendants of those whose lands were originally conquered. It is absurd to suppose that the ownership of land has continued, ever since its institution, in one exclusive caste. Further, what the community has a right to is, not the land in its present highly-cultivated state, but the land in its natural uncultivated condition. Improvements to that condition are just subjects of private ownership, and they are vested in the present possessors of the land. Hence resumption without compensation would be a gross and palpable act of injustice. Finally, it may be observed that, according to the best available calculations, the owners of land have, in virtue of their land, paid to the poor within the last three centuries no less than five hundred million pounds.

The whole controversy is a good illustration of the difficulty of arriving at practical rules of detail by simple deduction from first principles. Both parties appeal to Justice, and both can logically and legitimately do so. Who shall decide between them? Ethically, the only human solution is that one should convince the other that its claim contains the greater amount of justice, or, to speak more accurately, that the cause it advocates is, when all the data are rightly

consi  
made  
major  
chara  
Only  
being  
exper  
dicta  
alter  
gene  
justic

A  
also  
denie  
such  
other  
in eq  
weal  
does  
supp  
abilit  
again  
justif  
other  
for o  
justic  
share  
soun  
bute  
deser  
thoug  
insist  
deser  
quali  
start  
accid  
tages  
and p  
diffic  
viewi  
prese  
ment  
exist  
T  
dedu

considered, the only just one. Practically, the decision is made on combined grounds of justice and expediency, the majority of the sovereign assembly deciding, according to the character of its members, on one or other of these grounds. Only it is important to remember that the fact of a decision being given on grounds of expediency does not show that expediency is the real substratum of justice. A majority can dictate what course of action shall be pursued, but it cannot alter the true law of justice, and it may be that only a later generation is able to discern with certainty on which side justice actually lay.

A similar controversy to that concerning the land arises also in connexion with property at large. The communist denies that anyone has an exclusive right to anything, because such an exclusion implies a corresponding deprivation to others. All wealth is ultimately derived from land; land is in equity the property of the community; consequently all wealth is the property of the community. Every man who does his fair share of work according to his ability shall receive support from the common produce—not according to his ability, but taking an equal share, as man and man. Here again Mr. Spencer has to admit that a complete ethical justification for private property cannot be given; but on the other hand neither is there any complete ethical justification for communism. All men are not equal, and no law of justice can declare that unequal persons shall receive equal shares. Aristotle's law of distributive justice remains ethically sound, and the only difficulty is that the material to be distributed does not seem to be sufficient. If one man gets his full desert, another is likely to get less than his desert. Moreover, though Mr. Spencer appears to be on firm ground when he insists that a man who shows greater ingenuity or activity deserves a greater reward than one who is deficient in these qualities, he overlooks the consideration that all men do not start with equal opportunities. Why should one man, by the accident of birth, be lavishly endowed with material advantages, while another, infinitely his superior in mental, moral, and physical attributes, has barely enough to live on? It is difficult to find a 'complete ethical justification' for this, viewing the matter purely from the point of view of the present life. No doubt it is easy to produce powerful arguments on the score of expediency against disturbing the existing order of things; but expediency is not justice.

The last consideration raises another of the more dubious deductions from the principle of justice—namely, the right of

bequest ; and here again the abstract justice of the accepted system is not self-evident, though many advantages may be seen to arise from it. The strict political economist can have no doubt that free bequest, like private property, is economically desirable ; but political economy is not necessarily justice, and it is difficult to reconcile the system of bequest with the justice of giving every man a fair chance in life. Neither is it so self-evident as Mr. Spencer seems to think that the right to enjoy the product of one's exertions during one's life implies the right to dictate what shall become of those products after one's death. But it is impossible to argue at length all the problems raised by Mr. Spencer's application of the principle of Justice to the affairs of actual life. Each of them would furnish by itself the materials for an essay, if not a treatise ; and it is time to pass on to the subject which occupies the last third of Mr. Spencer's volume—namely, the political rights of men and the nature and limits of the duties of the State.

The questions connected with the relations between the man and the State are the oldest in social philosophy. Each reflective age has asked them, and each has answered them differently, according to its own different circumstances. Mr. Spencer is only the last link in a chain which reaches back through Mill and Bentham and Rousseau and Locke and Spinoza and Hobbes in the modern world to Aristotle and Plato in the ancient. Nor does the interest in them show any signs of waning ; on the contrary, they are being pushed to the front to day with fresh energy, and not the thinkers only but the actors in every State of Europe and America and Australia are confronted with the problem of Socialism, which is only one variant of the same question—What is the duty of the State towards the individual and of the individual towards the State ? In England the question has advanced with great rapidity during the past few years, and is now, and will be for some time to come, the gravest problem which statesmanship will have to meet. Is it possible that statesmen, of whatever party, will consent to meditate with open minds on the problem before them, and attempt to consider the fundamental principles on which the answer must be given ? With the political experience of the day before one, it is hardly possible to answer, Yes ; but much will be gained if any considerable body of private individuals will endeavour to form their own judgment upon it and to give effect and publicity to their opinions. Therefore, whether one agrees with his conclusions or not, one cannot but welcome the

contribution to the discussion which is made by Mr. Spencer in the final chapters of his latest volume.

Mr. Spencer's views will be no surprise to those who have read his earlier utterances on the same subject in *The Man versus the State* and several other essays. He is an individualist of the most uncompromising type, a Liberal of a generation ago, which is far from being the same as a Liberal of to-day. He has no faith in the efficacy of State interference, no hope that it can produce anything but the slackening of the national fibre and the destruction of the national economy. He holds firmly to the principle of Freedom—free trade, free competition, free contract. The Socialist, he says, in his zeal for Equality and Fraternity has forgotten the third member of the triad, Liberty, and would substitute for the tyranny against which he declaims another tyranny, not less unjust and not less disastrous. We have gone many steps in this direction already. We have compulsory education, compulsory sanitation, compulsory legislation for mines and factories; and we are asked to do much more. We are asked to regulate by law the hours of labour and the rate of wages; to hand over to the State the railways, the tramways, and other means of communication; to make the water companies and the gas companies departments of State, administered by Government or municipal officials. Wages shall be high, labour as plentiful as is desired, but not excessive, education and culture shall rise, the capitalist and the landlord shall no longer be a by-word, for they shall be improved out of existence—the State shall be the universal landlord, and the working-classes shall be the State. And then the Millennium shall come.

Or will it be the Deluge? The Socialist ideal may be a pretty one, and there may be more truth in it than is often admitted; but there is another side to the question, and Mr. Spencer and his supporters, such as Mr. Auberon Herbert and Mr. Mackay, have much to urge from the opposite point of view. It is comparatively easy to marshal the arguments that are used on either side; it has been done so often already, and by Mr. Spencer with conspicuous force and clearness. But it is less easy to hold the balance, to decide on which side the truth lies—or rather, which side has the most truth; for each has some. But first there are several points which any fair-minded man must admit to be in Mr. Spencer's favour.

First, it is clear that he is technically right in arguing that the 'political rights' of which so much has been made in

popular declamation during the present century are nought. A man, as a member of a State, has a right to a full liberty of self-development, subject to the equal rights of others; but a vote, as such, is not one of his rights nor is it in itself of the least value. It is only of value as a means of obtaining for its possessors such fair and just treatment as is necessary to secure for him the requisite liberty. It is not an end but a means. But although this contention is strictly correct, it is not really of importance; for the possession of a share of political power is in most civilized communities so necessary for the security of equitable treatment that the importance attached to it by those who do not possess it or have only recently acquired it is justifiable enough; and it is no great stretch of language to extend the term 'rights' from the end itself to the means essential for its attainment. Other considerations are of more importance, and perhaps the chief is this, that the tyranny of a majority is not one whit more justifiable than the tyranny of a minority. Justice stands exactly the same, whether it is supported at the moment by a majority or by a minority. This may perhaps be called a truism; but it is so common to find people speaking and acting as though the justification of any course were complete so soon as it can be shown that it is approved by a majority, that it is not unnecessary to recall this salutary principle. Therefore let it clearly be understood and admitted that the Socialist principle is neither proved nor disproved by the fact of a majority of electors being for or against it. The justice and the expediency of its proposals must be decided independently.

One powerful argument against the system which Socialists commend is urged with much force by Mr. Spencer, and that is the economic unsoundness of making the State the manager of industrial enterprises. Of all ways of getting anything done a Government office is generally the worst. A Royal Commission recently reported that the administration of the Admiralty was such as would land a private firm in the Bankruptcy Court in a few weeks; and it is likely that the same statement could be truthfully applied to many other departments of the Civil Service. It is not that the individual members are either incompetent or dishonest, but the absence of pressure, of competition, of incitement to individual enterprise and ingenuity, and the natural (indeed inevitable) system of fixed hours and fixed salaries, independent of results, inevitably lead to a state of things which will not bear comparison with that characteristic of a successful private firm. Nor

is th  
prom  
ways  
to th  
Soci  
man  
him.  
into  
its o  
cally  
priser

T  
paus  
the a  
with  
theor  
form  
and  
poss  
The  
is, as  
the  
defin  
subje  
from  
appli  
Ever  
limb,  
it, or  
in sh  
secur  
feren  
which  
conse  
indiv  
be th  
justic  
while  
the e  
servi  
shoul

T  
well,  
portio  
centu



is this an obscure and unrecognized fact ; for no one is more prompt to declaim against Government officials and all their ways than the very classes who would subject all industry to the direction of a Department of State. Further, State Socialism ignores the patent fact that it is far healthier for a man's character to do a thing himself than to have it done for him. A community, like an individual, loses fibre if it gets into the habit of looking for aid to the State instead of putting its own shoulder to the wheel. Morally as well as economically the substitution of State interference for private enterprise would be disastrous.

These are practical considerations, sufficient to give us pause before assenting to any wide-spreading extension of the activities of the State ; and Mr. Spencer supports them with a wealth of illustrations from actual facts. But there are theoretical considerations also. It is in connexion with the formula of Justice that the subject is now being considered ; and by following up the theoretical argument it may be possible to bring some light to bear upon this vexed question. The formula of Justice according to the Evolution philosophy is, as we have seen, that every individual should experience the consequences of his own actions ; which, being further defined, means that everyone should be free to act as he will, subject only to such restraints as are necessary to prevent him from interfering with the equal liberty of everyone else. The application of this principle to the Socialist claim is easy. Every man has a right to be secured against injury to life or limb, and against interference with his labour and the fruits of it, or with free locomotion, thought, and speech—the rights, in short, enumerated earlier in this article. These rights secure his free activity and do not impede it ; further interference impedes it, and consequently violates the purpose for which the State exists. The functions of the State should consequently be entirely negative, not positive. This is the individualist view ; and against it the Socialist maintains that, be the theory what it may, it does not practically end in justice ; that one class monopolises the good things of life, while another has all the hardships, and this without being, as the evolutionist theory would maintain, in any way less deserving or less competent. He therefore urges that the State should use its authority to redress the balance.

The theory of free competition and free contract sounds well, and it has been the creed and war-cry of the progressive portion of the community during a great part of the present century. The agitation against the Corn Laws brought the

abstract principles of political economy to the front, and for nearly two generations it has been regarded as heresy to maintain that obedience to them is not the be-all and the end-all of economical legislation. Now the wind is changing. The poorer classes have discovered that the advantages of free competition are not entirely on their side, that their numbers place them at a disadvantage, and that the bulk of the profits of commerce goes to the capitalist who employs them. The result is the present outcry for what is really another form of Protection—protection of labour by legislative interference with contract, in place of the old protection of produce by legislative interference with prices. And it is right that every fair-minded man should weigh the issue without prejudice. Economically, nothing except free competition is sound; but it must be fairly recognized that political economy does not give the absolute law of life. Cheapness of produce is not the ultimate goal of human existence, and it may be that the community would profit morally, physically, and intellectually, by abandoning the pursuit of cheapness and wealth as the sole object of the State. Further, there is much truth in the argument that what is called 'free contract' is not so free as it sounds. One party to the bargain is in a much stronger position than the other. The employer can afford to lie out of his money for a while in order to obtain better terms, or can import foreign labour rather than pay the wages demanded by native labour; but the labourer must take work within a very limited period or starve. Hence it requires powerful combination among the labourers to place them on an equality with the employer; and even then the employers are free to combine in their turn, and events have shown that a combination of employers is generally stronger than a combination of labourers.

Therefore we are not prepared to accept without question Mr. Spencer's application of the principle of justice, based though it is on laws alike of economy and evolution. Nor, when we look to results, do the facts seem to bear him out so completely as he would have us believe. It is hard to maintain seriously that everyone who is born in a comfortable station in life is, as according to evolutionary principles he ought to be, better adapted to make the most of life than those who are born in a lower station, or that he is in any sense 'fitter to survive.' Is there even such an approximation to truth in it as to justify leaving him in possession of all the advantages and the others in possession of all the difficulties, without making any effort to redress the balance? Take the

1892  
av  
Enc  
form  
such  
posi  
mai  
thin  
ende  
lower  
State  
effor  
ably  
perm  
State  
that  
denn  
but  
negle  
activ  
State  
neigh  
them  
the re  
pool.  
interf  
railwa  
that i  
may  
compa  
wheth  
requir  
at leas  
educat  
sense  
only e  
nation  
petitio  
Spence  
to secu  
surely  
necessa  
foreign  
Son

VOL.

average man from Piccadilly and the average man from Mile End Road, and although you may reasonably say that the former is the finer specimen of humanity, is there yet any such vast difference in character and capabilities as there is in position and opportunities? The affirmative can hardly be maintained without intentional paradox.

But then (and this is a more difficult question), can anything be done to redress the balance, except by such private endeavour as is directed towards elevating the position of the lower classes? Here the objection, already formulated, to State aid comes in; and it is unquestionably true that private effort, unostentatious and gradual as its progress must inevitably be, achieves results far more satisfactory and far more permanent than those of the much sought and advertised State legislation. At the same time it is going too far to say that nothing can be done by the State. Mr. Spencer condemns even compulsory sanitation and compulsory education; but even he is not wholly consistent. On the one hand, neglect of sanitation is precisely one of the injuries to the free activity of others such as it is admitted to be the duty of the State to prevent. It is just as bad for a man to give his neighbours typhoid fever as to run a knife into them or shut them up in prison; and I cannot be said to be experiencing the results of my own actions if I die of my neighbour's cesspool. On the other hand, Mr. Spencer allows the State to interfere with free contract by compulsorily taking land for railways or other public improvements;<sup>1</sup> the ground being that it is acting as the trustee for the nation. But if the State may thus interfere between the individual and a railway company, and require the former to give up land to the latter, whether he likes it or not, it is hard to see why it may not also require the individual to have his children educated, which is at least equally for the good of the whole community. Free education is open to reasonable objection, as lessening the sense of parental responsibility; but compulsory education only enforces that sense. Moreover, it is necessary for a nation to be educated to hold its own in the industrial competition with other nations; and if it is legitimate, as Mr. Spencer allows, to use such compulsion as may be necessary to secure the safety of the nation against foreign attack, it is surely equally legitimate to use such compulsion as may be necessary to secure it against the equally disastrous effects of foreign competition.

Some State interference is consequently seen to be ad-

<sup>1</sup> *Justice*, p. 212.

mitted by Mr. Spencer, and more to follow from his own principles. The only question is, where to draw the line. One condition that may be laid down is that the State should not be invoked if the desired end can be attained by private activities; for if a right act is done voluntarily it strengthens the character, while if it is done under compulsion it has no moral value at all. Secondly, the State should not interfere unless there is a general agreement among the persons affected that its interference is just and necessary. For instance, compulsory vaccination or education is only justifiable if the large majority of the nation is convinced of the necessity of these processes; so that the compulsion is, except in a few instances, felt to be a voluntary surrender with a view to obtaining the desired end in an adequate manner. For the State now to decree that no one should work more than eight hours a day, or that no one should obtain a glass of beer on Sunday, would be unjustifiable interference with the liberty of individuals; but it is possible that opinion may so far change as to make such legislation permissible without injustice. But it would be better that employers and employed should agree on a normal working day, as is largely the case in Australia, or that publicans should agree to close their houses during the greater part of Sunday. Then no injustice is done to anyone, and no ground is left for ill-feeling.

The principle here advocated may seem to be merely opportunist; but the fact is that, for the very simple reason already indicated, it is impossible to lay down *à priori* rules for the application of the maxim of justice to public legislation. Legislation can only touch the external action, and not the internal principle; and although the internal principle is always the same, the external expression of it varies from generation to generation. It was perfectly just that the agricultural labourer should have no participation in public affairs a century ago; it is not perfectly just now. Further, there is an explanation of which one would have expected Mr. Spencer to be the first to make use, arising from the distinction between the ideal and the practicable, or, as he would express it, between absolute ethics and relative ethics. This is a distinction which he employs in this volume, as he employs it freely elsewhere. Mr. Spencer is no friend to the military proclivities of mankind; but he recognizes that the militant stage is not yet passed, and consequently it is the duty of the State to see to the efficient protection of the community from foreign invasion. The free activities of indi-

viduals are subject to such interference as is necessary to secure this end; taxation for military and naval purposes, compulsory acquirement of land for forts and dockyards, monopoly of railways in time of war, and in the last resort conscription, are justifiable on this ground. Why should not the same argument be applied to matters connected with peaceful industries? Each nation must earn its own livelihood; and, in the present imperfect stage of the evolution of mankind, international amity prevails even less in industrial than in militant affairs. Each nation would willingly oust its neighbour from its position in the markets of the world; and as plenty and prosperity and progress depend largely upon industrial development, it follows that each nation must see to its own interests. If, then, legislative enactments can give a country a better chance of industrial survival, there appears to be no valid ground against such enactments which will not equally apply to interferences with individual liberty with a view to security against military aggression. The only principle which can be safely asserted is that the necessity for such interferences must be clearly made out. Protection, which raises the price of food, and thereby limits the effective power of the labourer, may be necessary under certain conditions, since without it a community may be unable to carry on its industries profitably; but the presumption is against it, and the case in favour of it requires to be clearly made out, and must be subject to re-examination from time to time. The whole position may be summed up thus: State interference is an evil, but under certain circumstances it is necessary; and the circumstances vary from time to time, and must be submitted to the most suspicious scrutiny.

On the whole, then, we seem to find the following results. Justice is a virtue which is concerned with the intercourse between man and man. Its fundamental principle, that each man should have his own, is permanent; but the details to which any man can at any given time rightly lay claim vary from age to age. Mankind is always approaching, as one may legitimately believe, towards the ideal condition under which every man will have a fair and equal share in life, and no one will encroach on his neighbour. The State follows this progress, registers and secures it by its laws; but it cannot go before and force on people a standard of intercourse for which they do not yet feel the moral justification. The relations of man to man, of rich to poor, of employer to employed, have not yet reached the ideal standard of justice; but the State can only promote in a secondary way the

attainment of that ideal. The true foundation of progress is in the moral sense, the conscience, of mankind. Men have learnt that they may not treat their fellow-man as a slave. They are learning that they may not restrict the free utterance of his thought. They will learn one day that they may not extort from him the hardest terms which their relative economic positions enable them to demand. Political economy must be moralized and humanized; and on this recognition of the fact that every man should have a fair chance to make the best of his life, physically, intellectually, and morally, a physical, intellectual, and moral improvement in the whole nation will naturally follow. But it is only slowly, and by the infinitesimal labour of individuals, that this advance can be won. The State cannot do it, unless the individuals who compose the State do it first in their own hearts and consciences. Then a great step forward will have been made in the moralization of human life, and that life will have approached one step nearer to the ideal set before it, centuries ago, by Christ.

---

#### ART. IV.—ISAAC WILLIAMS AND THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

*The Autobiography of Isaac Williams, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Oxford.* Edited by his brother-in-law, the Ven. Sir GEORGE PREVOST, Bart. (London, 1892.)

THIS *Autobiography* fills a most important gap in the accounts we have recently been receiving of those who took part on one side or the other in the Oxford Movement. The name of Mr. Isaac Williams may not have been so prominently before the public as that of some of those who worked with him, but his personal influence was very direct and important, whilst his writings both in prose and verse have been very widely read, and some of them still retain their position amongst the works of a devotional character that are valued. It is satisfactory to find that considerable interest is felt in this *Life*, as a second edition has been called for within a few weeks of its first publication.

The *Autobiography* before us has completely escaped the error into which most modern books of the kind have fallen. There has been no attempt to amplify what it says, and to



repeat special points in the life by inserting letters to and from friends dealing with the same matters, or seeking to impress characteristics of the subject of the book by multiplying examples of their display. The *Autobiography* is evidently what it professes to be, a simple account of events in the life of Mr. Williams which he wrote for the information and benefit of his children without any thought of its ever being published to the world. There is consequently about it an air of freshness and simplicity such as we rarely meet with. And it may be well perhaps to note that the *Autobiography* would probably have never seen the light if it had not been for the urgent request of friends, to whom the manuscript was shown, and to a curious mistake into which the late Dean of St. Paul's accidentally fell in his interesting account of the Oxford Movement. He there says of Isaac Williams :

'He describes himself as coming up to Trinity, where he soon got a scholarship, an ambitious and careless youth, who had never heard a word about Christianity, and to whom religion, its aims and its restraints, were a mere name' (p. 58).

This was evidently a slight confusion of memory on the part of the Dean, and Mr. Williams's surviving relatives were anxious to publish this *Autobiography* in order to vindicate the religious character of Mr. Williams's parents and of the education which he had received from them. This is evident from what is said in the *Autobiography*. Speaking of a private preparatory school to which he was sent he writes :

'Almost the first boys I came in contact with, on leaving home, produced on my mind a very startling impression. I remember then feeling, for the first time, that I understood what the Bible and the Catechism meant by speaking of the world as "wicked." In early life I was often much affected with strong impressions on the shortness of life, and the transitory nature of all human things, and was greatly taken with Sherlock on Death, sentences of which haunted me like some musical strain' (p. 3).

And again, just before he went to read with Mr. John Keble :

'Influences of school and college had done very much to undo the blessed inspirations of childhood, home instructions, and maternal warnings ; and the eye of God set on the soul at Baptism had well-nigh withdrawn itself, although still all was fair without and of good report, which renders man more loathsome in the sight of God' (p. 14).

No doubt it was this account of himself, that Isaac Williams had given, which lingered in the mind of the good Dean, as he had seen the manuscript autobiography, and he forgot that

the evil influences were those of school and college and not of home. But let us turn to the life itself.

There is prefixed a short preface to his children, written by himself, and apparently written because he feared that he would not live until they reached a time of life when they would remember him, as he suffered grievously for a great number of years from asthma, which must have made him feel to an unusual extent how uncertain life was. In this preface he says :

'If any of you should live to manhood, you will be glad to know something of the history of my life, and the more so as parts of it have been spent among persons and circumstances in themselves of some interest and moment, and such as must have some effect on the future character and history of the Church in this country.'

Whilst desirous to impress upon his children's minds the importance of the religious movement in which he took part, and such points in his own life as he thinks may tend to their religious edification, he is very silent about much that himself had done, and the efforts he had made to assist the religious cause, to the furtherance of which he dedicated his life. To read the *Autobiography* no one would suppose that he had been the voluminous writer he was, as he only speaks of three of the *Tracts for the Times*, about one of which there had been considerable controversy, and the *Cathedral*, a volume of poetry. Beside these he published a devotional commentary on the Gospels extending over many volumes ; a *Harmony of the Gospels* ; *The Apocalypse, with Notes and Reflections* ; *The Beginning of the Book of Genesis* ; *Sermons on the Characters of the Old Testament* ; on *The Female Characters of Holy Scripture* ; on the Catechism ; and on the Epistles and Gospels for the Sundays and Holy days throughout the year. Beside these volumes in prose he published a series of poems on the Christian seasons, *The Baptistry*, and a considerable number of poems in the *Lyra Apostolica*.

This preface fairly represents what is to be found in the *Autobiography*. It contains much of the deepest interest with respect to the persons and circumstances that had so seriously and beneficially affected the condition of the Church in this country ; whilst of the events of Isaac Williams's maturer life it says but little. That life was a comparatively uneventful one. The son of a Chancery barrister whose home was in Wales, but whose profession obliged him to spend a large part of each year in London, he was sent early to a preparatory school, and after that to Harrow. He was a most

apt  
for  
who  
athl  
Ox  
an  
gain  
ledg  
was

'Om  
rema  
little  
the  
look  
opin  
may  
of hi

This  
life.  
at S  
in s  
seve  
Mov  
befo  
Abe  
that  
he w  
This  
and  
1829  
be c  
John  
he as  
note  
durin  
fesso  
reach  
elect  
the  
cause  
the y  
of th  
this  
givin  
bett

apt pupil, and delighted in the composition of Latin verses, for which he gained many prizes; and, like many other men who have attained to literary eminence, he delighted in athletic sports, especially cricket. From Harrow he went to Oxford, where he became a scholar of Trinity College, and as an undergraduate he gained the Latin verse prize. After gaining this prize John Keble, of whom he had a slight knowledge previously, offered to look over it with him before it was printed and recited.

'On looking it over with him I was exceedingly amazed at his remarks, and said on coming away, "Keble has more poetry in his little finger than Milman in his whole body." For Milman was then the great poet of Oxford, and, as Poetry Professor, he also had been looking over my poem with me. But on venturing to quote Keble's opinion at that time to my tutor at Trinity, he said, "John Keble may understand Aristotle, but he knows nothing of poetry. It is out of his line"' (pp. 13, 14).

This meeting with Mr. Keble was the turning-point of his life. It led to his reading with him during the long vacation at Southrop, a little village in Gloucestershire, that year and in several following ones. There he had as companions several men who were afterwards prominent in the Oxford Movement. Unfortunately Isaac Williams's health failed him before he took his degree, and under the stern orders of Abernethy he was debarred from reading for some time, so that instead of taking a first class as his friends anticipated, he was obliged to content himself with an ordinary degree. This, however, did not prevent his election to a fellowship and to his subsequently becoming tutor of his college. In 1829, before his election to a fellowship, he was ordained to be curate of Windrush, a village not far from Fairford, where John Keble resided, and after he resumed residence in Oxford he assisted Newman as his curate at St. Mary's. The most noteworthy event, so far as the outer world estimates events, during his residence at Oxford was the contest for the Professorship of Poetry. At the end of 1841, Mr. Keble having reached the end of the term of years for which he had been elected, resigned, and Isaac Williams became a candidate for the vacant chair. The air was filled with the excitement caused by the publication of 'Tract 90' in the earlier part of the year, and the opponents and lukewarm or timid friends of the *Tracts for the Times* thought that the opportunity of this election ought not to be lost for protesting against or giving a warning hint to the writers. Accordingly Mr. Garbett was proposed in opposition to Mr. Williams, and the

election was carried on throughout by Mr. Garbett's supporters as a question of confidence or want of confidence in the principles advocated by the *Tracts for the Times*, with the result, at that time tolerably certain to follow, that the Tractarian candidate was defeated. He remained in Oxford until 1842, when he married Miss Caroline Champernowne, and at the same time removed to Bisley, where he laboured as curate to Mr. Thomas Keble, until his very serious illness in 1846, when for weeks, if not for months, he seemed to be hovering between life and death. From this illness he so far recovered as to live many years, but it practically incapacitated him from further active work in a parish. He accordingly removed to Stinchcombe, a parish in Gloucestershire, of which his brother-in-law, Sir George Prevost, was vicar, and there he lived till his death in 1865.

There are, then, two chief points of interest to which this *Autobiography* calls our attention. The one is the influences by which Mr. Isaac Williams's own religious opinions were formed; the other is what he says concerning the other chief actors in the Oxford Movement, and the growth and tendencies in the minds of some which led them to desert the Church of their baptism, whilst others remained true and steadfast members of it to the end.

The admirable manner in which the formation of Isaac Williams's religious opinions is described by Dean Church places the matter so fairly and clearly before us that it would be impossible to improve upon it. We therefore venture to make a long extract from his book on the Oxford Movement.

'From Keble, or it may be said from the Kebles, he received his theology. The Kebles were all of them men of the old-fashioned High Church orthodoxy, of the Prayer Book and the Catechism, the orthodoxy which was professed at Oxford, which was represented in London by Norris of Hackney and Joshua Watson; which valued in religion sobriety, reverence, and deference to authority, and in teaching sound learning and the wisdom of the great English divines; which vehemently disliked the Evangelicals and Methodists for their poor and loose theology, their love of excitement and display, their hunting after popularity. This Church of England divinity was the theology of the old vicar of Coln St. Aldwyn's, a good scholar and a good parish priest, who had brought up his two sons at home to be scholars, and had impressed his solid and manly theology on them so strongly that amid all changes they remained at bottom true to their paternal training. John Keble added to it great attainments and brilliant gifts of imagination and poetry; but he never lost the plain, down-right, almost awkward ways of conversation and manner of his simple

hom  
singul  
on th  
clergy  
Keble  
an ol  
"effe  
its no  
ancie  
Praye  
the in  
type t  
curt a  
whole  
straig  
Isaac  
of sol  
seekin  
calm a  
as fell  
ence,  
both t

Be  
added  
see th  
flocks  
which  
Much  
day.  
of the  
grade  
they h  
appea  
they  
farmer  
at the  
shame  
Thom  
whole  
for he  
for the  
both f  
which  
them v  
were s  
costly

home—ways which might have seemed abrupt and rough but for the singular sweetness and charm of his nature. To those who looked on the outside he was always the homely, rigidly orthodox country clergyman. On Isaac Williams, with his ethical standard, John Keble also impressed his ideas of religious truth. He made him an old-fashioned High Churchman, suspicious of excitement and "effect," suspicious of the loud-talking religious world, suspicious of its novelties and shallowness, and clinging with his whole soul to ancient ways and sound Church of England doctrine reflected in the Prayer Book. And from John Keble's influence he passed under the influence of Thomas Keble, the Vicar of Bisley, a man of sterner type than his brother, with strong and definite opinions on all subjects, curt and keen in speech, intolerant of all that seemed to threaten wholesome teaching and the interests of the Church, and equally straightforward, equally simple, in manners and life. Under him Isaac Williams began his career as a clergyman. He spent two years of solitary and monotonous life in a small cure [at Windrush], seeking comfort from solitude in poetical composition ["It was very calm and subduing," he writes], and then he was recalled to Oxford as fellow and tutor of his college, to meet a new and stronger influence, which it was part of the work and trial of the rest of his life both to assimilate and to resist' (pp. 61-2).

Before leaving this part of the subject, it ought to be added that it was no small attraction to Isaac Williams to see the way in which the Kebles cared for the poor of their flocks, and to share in those labours of love for their benefit which made their influence felt throughout their parishes. Much of what they did is commonly found at the present day. It was not so common sixty years since. In the days of the old poor law, when the agricultural labourers were degraded by receiving a portion of the scanty pittance on which they had to live from the rates levied for the poor, they had to appear before the overseers of the parish to obtain the relief they required. These overseers were for the most part farmers, who strove to reduce the allowance to a minimum, and at the same time often bullied the unhappy applicants in a shameless manner. To protect these unfortunate people Mr. Thomas Keble regularly sat with the overseers during the whole time they were engaged in seeing the needy petitioners for help, and did his best to secure justice and consideration for them. At the same time he established clothing clubs, both for the children in the schools and the cottagers, to which he contributed in a princely manner. He also supplied them with rice and other food at a cheap rate, and when they were sick he furnished them with medicines which were more costly than the ill-paid parish doctor was likely to supply. In

all these labours Isaac Williams heartily joined, and his fame as a doctor was so great in Bisley that when patients were given over by the parish official they applied to him for advice and treatment, and he not infrequently was the means of restoring to health those whose cases had been pronounced desperate by the parish doctor.

Another specialty of the Keble school was its love for the daily services as ordered by the Prayer Book.

'Thomas Keble had resolved about 1816, when he made that collection of "Authorities for the use of the Daily Service" published in the *Tracts for the Times*, that if ever he had a parish of his own he would at once begin daily service, which he did immediately on coming to reside at Bisley in 1827. This was the origin of the revival of the daily service. The Kebles at Fairford were in the habit of reading the daily Church Service in their family, and when Thomas Keble (in the year 1827) had the living of Bisley given him, then in lieu of the prayer meetings which had been customary in that parish he established the daily service in the church, which was then spoken of as a strange fancy. Having been, therefore, long accustomed to this, when I first became Newman's curate at St. Mary's, in common with a great many less definite opinions and practices which I imported from Bisley, one was a daily morning service at St. Mary's, to which we afterwards added this service at Littlemore in the afternoon, so that there should be both services daily in the parish.'<sup>1</sup>

The above details have been given to show as clearly as may be the views of that side of those engaged in the Oxford Movement with which Isaac Williams sympathized. It may be well next to point out the different standing-ground of those united with them in the same work, but from whom they came to differ more and more.

For the most part the leading men of this kind belonged at the outset to the Low Church school. The following shows the great change of opinion in Newman :

'Perhaps there is no more extraordinary instance of the changes which Newman had undergone than in the "Home Thoughts Abroad" which Newman published in the *British Magazine* on his first going abroad with Froude in 1831-2, for in those papers he expresses his astonishment at the exact and wonderful fulfilment of the prophecies that represented Rome and its bishop as the Antichrist, which, although he had always held, he said he never could have realized had he not witnessed its idolatries. But the next time he visited Rome it was as a Roman Catholic. Archdeacon Wilberforce mentioned to me here, before he himself joined the Church of Rome, that, when fellows of Oriel together, Pusey, Froude, himself, and Newman used to meet together on Sunday evenings, when

<sup>1</sup> *Autobiography*, pp. 75-6.

Newman  
view, th

Then

'Re  
John K  
having  
"What  
stead of  
puts it  
religion  
pretensi  
brought  
one occ  
thing th  
But whe  
depth o  
gaged in  
himself  
(pp. 28-

Rob  
ample,  
nected  
themsel  
Newman  
Copelan  
of Row  
gains a  
definitel  
Thomas  
the begin  
of thoug  
ciating  
which af  
caused r  
*Autobiog*  
the late  
us acqu  
generally  
himself a

'Our p  
of the Div  
more to th  
Churchma  
of sentime  
recommen



Newman used eloquently to expound the Apocalypse, taking Mede's view, that the Pope is Antichrist' (pp. 44-5 n.)

Then of two others :

'Robert Wilberforce, who spent one long vacation there [with Mr. John Keble], did not feel towards John Keble as we did *at that time*, having been brought up in an opposite school ; he observed one day, "What a strange person Keble is ; there is Law's *Serious Call*, instead of leaving it about to do people good, I see he reads it and puts it out of the way, hiding it in a drawer." The same reality in religion and self-discipline, to the rejection of appearances and all pretension, had a remarkable effect on Ryder. He also had been brought up in a strict evangelical school of the better kind ; and on one occasion got up and left a college party in consequence of something that Froude had said that seemed to him to be of a light kind. But when he afterwards came to know the deep self-humiliation and depth of devotion there was in Froude's character, which was engaged in the discipline of the heart, he became so shocked with himself and his own opinions that he adopted the opposite course' (pp. 28-9).

Robert Wilberforce and Ryder followed Newman's example, and became Roman Catholics ; some there were connected with the movement sooner or later who ranged themselves with the Keble school, whilst others followed Newman's guidance. Amongst the former were Dr. Pusey, Copeland of Trinity, Marriott, Sir George Prevost, and Wilson of Rownhams ; amongst the latter, Ward and Oakely, Dalgairns and Anderdon ; whilst there were others who did not definitely belong to either of these schools, such as Froude, Thomas and James Mozley, Church, &c. There were from the beginning underlying differences between the two schools of thought that have been named, in their manner of appreciating events, and in tendencies of their natural character, which after a time manifested themselves more openly, and caused misunderstandings amongst them with which this *Autobiography*, and the volume on the Oxford Movement by the late Dean of St. Paul's, and the life of W. G. Ward, make us acquainted to an extent that had been previously little generally known. Isaac Williams thus describes the views of himself and of those who most fully sympathized with him :

'Our principles then were of the Caroline Divines, thinking much of the Divine right of kings and the like, but we approached perhaps more to those of the non-jurors. Newman was now becoming a Churchman ; the first thing he did publicly, which marked this change of sentiment, had been a pamphlet on the Church Missionary Society, recommending the clergy to join it in order that by their numbers

they might correct that Calvinistic leaven on account of which they were opposed to it' (p. 47).

Then, looking at Newman in the earlier days of their intercourse, he says :

'I was greatly charmed and delighted with Newman, who was exceedingly kind to me, but did not altogether trust his opinions, and although Froude was in the habit of stating things in an extreme and paradoxical manner, yet one always felt conscious of a thorough foundation of truth and principle in him—a ground of entire confidence and agreement—but this was not so with Newman, even although one appeared more in unison with his more moderate statements. Our principles were so little those of Newman up to this time, that he had been the cause of Hawkins being elected Provost of Oriel instead of Keble' (p. 48).

And then, as showing the difference in their natural characteristics, or possibly in the manner in which they had been educated :

'I can remember a strong feeling of difference I felt on acting together with Newman from what I had been accustomed to, that he was in the habit of looking for effect, for what was sensibly effective, which from the Bisley and Fairford school I had been long habituated to avoid' (p. 54).

Perhaps the most startling evidence of this difference of feeling was shown in Newman's anxiety to learn the influence which the Oxford Tracts were making in the early days of their publication upon the country clergy. He tells us in the *Apologia* :

'I presented myself in 1833 with some of the first papers of the movement to a country clergyman in Northamptonshire ; he paused awhile, and then eyeing me with significance, asked "Whether Whately was at the bottom of them?" . . . The visit which I made to the Northamptonshire Rector was only one of a series of similar expedients which I adopted during the year 1833. I called upon clergy in various parts of the country, whether I was acquainted with them or not, and I attended at the houses of friends where several of them were from time to time assembled. I do not think that much came of such attempts, nor were they quite in my way. Also I wrote various letters to clergymen which fared not much better, except that they advertised the fact that a rally in favour of the Church was commencing. I did not care whether my visits were made to high Church or low Church ; I wished to make a strong pull in union with all who were opposed to the principles of liberalism whoever they might be' (pp. 110-11).

What a contrast this to the principles by which the Keble school were actuated :

'I h  
duty in  
earnestl  
So ave  
to pro  
service  
objecti  
would  
But  
and ter  
gaged i  
union a  
appeare  
and a  
appeare  
though  
had be  
Bishops  
the stre  
an eccle  
seemed  
stand te  
said Mr.  
an inter  
must be  
W. Palm  
Froude  
1833. T  
tion like  
Associat  
differenc  
as to the  
the union  
this mov  
address t  
doctrine  
tensively  
But t  
essential,  
threatenin  
of Church  
*Magazine*  
he was th

'I had been taught there [at Bisley and Fairford] to do one's duty in faith and leave the effect to God, and that all the more earnestly because there were no sympathies from without to answer.'<sup>1</sup>

So averse were the Kebles to what was popular and calculated to produce effect, that they would never have an evening service on Sundays, because it seemed to them open to moral objections, although in their country parishes such services would have been attended by the largest congregations.

But whilst there were such differences of natural character and tendencies in the men who at first, or later on, were engaged in the Oxford Movement, there was a strong bond of union amongst them, in the presence of which differences disappeared for the time, and that was attachment to the Church and a desire to do what they could to defend it in what appeared to be its hour of peril. At that time it seemed as though the greatest changes were imminent. Ten Irish sees had been destroyed; the Prime Minister had bidden the Bishops set their house in order; the Bishops were insulted in the streets, and it seemed as though everything was ripe for an ecclesiastical revolution. To stem the tide at the moment seemed difficult, if not impossible. 'If I thought we could stand ten or fifteen years as we are I should have little fear,' said Mr. H. J. Rose, but there appeared small chance of such an interval being allowed. No time was to be lost, something must be done and at once, was the feeling under which Mr. W. Palmer of Worcester College, Mr. A. Percival, and Mr. Froude met at the house of Mr. Rose at Hadleigh in July 1833. The first suggestion was the formation of an association like the English Church Union or the Church Defence Association of our day; but this fell through on account of differences of opinion relative to the mention of doctrine, and as to the importance of insisting upon the maintenance of the union of Church and State as long as possible. The form this movement eventually took was the drawing up of an address to the Archbishop of Canterbury in defence of the doctrine and discipline of the Church, which was very extensively signed.

But this was not all. It was evident that writing was essential, that the evils of the time must be exposed, that the threatening dangers must be brought home to the convictions of Churchmen. To do this papers appeared in the *British Magazine*, which Mr. Rose had recently started and of which he was the editor. The Oxford men wanted more than this.

<sup>1</sup> *Autobiography*, p. 54.

They wanted publications which would startle and frighten apathetic Churchmen, and those most interested know that committees are not likely to produce such writings. Isaac Williams tells us :

'The circumstance which I most remember about that time was a conversation with Froude, which was the first commencement of the *Tracts for the Times*. He returned full of energy and of a prospect of doing something for the Church, and we walked in the Trinity College Gardens and discussed the subject. He said in his manner, "Isaac, we must make a row in the world. Why should we not? Only consider what the Peculiars, *i.e.* the Evangelicals, have done with a few half-truths to work upon! And with our principles, if we set resolutely to work, we can do the same." I said, "I have no doubt we can make a noise and may get people to join us, but shall we make them really better Christians? If they take up our principles in a hollow way, as the Peculiars [this was a name Froude had given the Low Church party] have done theirs, what good shall we do?" To this Froude said, "Church principles forced on people's notice must work for good. However, we must try; and Newman and I are determined to set to work as soon as he returns, and you must join us"' (pp. 62-4).

Hence followed what Newman tells us in his *Apologia* :

'I, on the other hand, had out of my own head begun the *Tracts*, and these, as representing the antagonistic principle of personality, were looked upon by Mr. Palmer's friends with considerable alarm. The great point at the time with these good men in London—some of them men of the highest principle and far from being influenced by what we used to call Erastianism—was to put down the *Tracts*. I, as their editor, and mainly their author, was not unnaturally willing to give way. Keble and Froude advocated their continuance strongly, and were angry with me for consenting to stop them' (p. 109).

Isaac Williams thus speaks of their early reception :

'All the circumstances which were now taking place indicated the silent progress of the movement. When the *Tracts* were first published little or no notice was taken of them. I remember asking my pupil, Neville, as he went home for the vacation, to call at book-sellers' shops in large towns and to inquire for the *Tracts* and to ask them to procure them. I did so myself. But by degrees Newman, when I daily went to his rooms after my lecture, would have some little incident to mention which implied that the movement was not dead. Then I remember his finding, to his great delight, an allusion to the *Tracts* in the *Times* newspaper' (pp. 81-2).

The late Dean of St. Paul's thus eloquently describes the growth of the movement :

no  
not  
party  
grow  
rally  
a nu  
of g  
and c  
men  
to en  
by or  
fear,  
thing  
tricity  
them  
religio  
prejud  
more  
questi  
their  
who v  
teaching  
and re  
doubt  
attracti  
these y  
prise, c  
frighten  
others,  
led on  
could n  
156-7).

The  
the feel  
picture

'Ma  
Church  
Universi  
unanim  
present  
seller's sh  
by a han  
They wil  
that time  
of failure,  
of the U  
Divinity

'There was no attempt to form a party or to proselytise; there was no organisation, no distinct and recognized party marks. "I would not have it called a party," writes Newman in the *Apologia*. But a party it could not help being; quietly and spontaneously it had grown to be what community of ideas, aims, and sympathies, naturally, and without blame, leads men to become. And it had acquired a number of recognized nicknames, to friends and enemies the sign of growing concentration. For the questions stated in the *Tracts* and outside them became of increasing interest to the more intelligent men who had finished their University course, and were preparing to enter into life—the Bachelors and younger Masters of Arts. One by one they passed from various states of mind—alienation, suspicion, fear, indifference, blank ignorance—into a consciousness that something beyond the mere commonplace of religious novelty and eccentricity, of which there had been a good deal recently, was before them; that doctrines and statements running counter to the received religious language of the day—doctrines about which, in confident prejudice, they had perhaps bandied about offhand judgments—had more to say for themselves than was thought at first; that the questions thus raised drove them in on themselves, and appealed to their honesty and seriousness; and that, at any rate, in the men who were arresting so much attention, however extravagant their teaching might be called, there was a remarkable degree of sober and reserved force, an earnestness of conviction which could not be doubted, and undeniable and subtle power of touching souls and attracting sympathies. One by one, and in many different ways, these young men went through various stages of curiosity, of surprise, of perplexity, of doubt, of misgiving, of interest; some were frightened, and wavered, and drew back more or less reluctantly; others, in spite of themselves, in spite of opposing influences, were led on step by step, hardly knowing whither, by a spell which they could not resist, of intellectual, or, still more, moral pressure' (pp. 156-7).

There is something in Williams's *Autobiography*, showing the feeling of older men in the University, which makes this picture still more striking:

'Many concurring circumstances had now tended to strengthen Church principles. The attempt of the Government to force the University to receive Dissenters, which was thrown back by the unanimous action of the whole body. I remember Denison, the present Bishop of Salisbury, meeting Newman in Parker the bookseller's shop, and saying: "To make a stand against the Government by a handful of men here is absurd. What do they care for you? They will only despise you." But the event was very different. At that time we were determined to go by faith and not mind the chance of failure, and the stand so gathered strength that we had a meeting of the University in Magdalen Common Room, with Burton, the Divinity Professor, in the chair, and a determination in favour of a

strong simultaneous resistance became almost unanimous' (pp. 94-5).

But the differences of opinion already spoken of soon made themselves felt. At the outset of the publication of the *Tracts* some dissevered themselves from the movement more or less directly, whilst some who had at first declined to throw their lot in with its supporters—notably Dr. Pusey—joined their ranks. The excitement spread, general attention was called to the important Church questions which were mooted, the number of friends and adherents rapidly multiplied, and the keen tooth of bitter hostility was sharpened.

Then it was that Williams tells us :

'I watched from the beginning, and saw among ourselves greater dangers than those from without, which I attempted to obviate by publishing the *Plain Sermons*. I attempted in vain to get the Kebles to publish, in order to keep pace with Newman, and so to maintain a more practical turn in the movement. I remember C. Cornish coming to me and saying, as we walked in Trinity Gardens, "People are a little afraid of being carried away by Newman's brilliancy; they want more of the steady sobriety of the Kebles infused into the movement to keep us safe. We have so much sail, we want ballast." And the effect of the *Plain Sermons* was at the time very quieting : they soothed the alarms of many . . . I thought of publishing these sermons in connexion with the *Tracts*, and with Newman's concurrence undertook it, being actuated with fears for the result of Newman's restless intellectual theories. I wrote the preface for those sermons, expressing my apprehensions ; but this advertisement was so altered at Bisley by Jeffreys and others as to have been quite spoilt, as things are which are written by one person and altered by others' (pp. 96-7).

To keep the friends together who had started the movement at Oxford

'Pusey formed a plan of our meeting every Friday evening at his house, and reading lectures on some point in Divinity. Some of the *Tracts for the Times* were written for that purpose. Such was my "Tract No. 80." I had now been in the habit of reading Origen's *Commentaries on the Gospels*, and there observed how much he alluded to a mysterious holding back of sacred truth, such as I had always been struck with in the conduct of the Kebles. And this view was much confirmed by my own studies connected with our college lectures on the Gospels, which led me constantly to notice this in our Lord's conduct. At Norman Hill in the vacation I wrote out these thoughts in an essay ; showed it to John Keble, who wished it to be one of the *Tracts*, and I read it at Pusey's on a Friday. When talking of it there with Newman and Pusey, the former suggested that we should attach to it the name of "Reserve in Religious

Teach  
alarmed

The  
Movem  
thus de

'As  
qualified  
English  
that tem  
its first  
exciteme  
visible h  
these we  
scholars  
fifty yea  
men of  
mark on  
classes r  
W. G. V  
different

The las  
larly ab  
land, or  
amount  
tolerate.  
special t  
direction  
special r  
to his co  
of what

'Noth  
lived dai  
from any  
character,  
Keble and  
Often wh  
deep sigh  
ness of th  
and had r  
often spok  
Church o  
issue' (pp  
condemna  
his sensiti  
remember  
to me of v

VOL. X



Teaching." I mention this circumstance because some were more alarmed at the name than anything else' (pp. 89-90).

The internal troubles of those interested in the Oxford Movement were soon intensified by another cause, which is thus described by the late Dean of St. Paul's :

'As the time went on, men joined the movement who had but qualified sympathy with that passionate love and zeal for the actual English Church, that acquaintance with its historical theology, and that temper of discipline, sobriety, and self-distrust which marked its first representatives. These younger men shared in the growing excitement of the society round them. They were attracted by visible height of character and brilliant intellectual power. Some of these were men of wide and abstruse learning ; quaint and eccentric scholars both in habit and look, students of the ancient type, who even fifty years ago seemed out of date to their generation. Some were men of considerable force of mind, destined afterwards to leave a mark on their age as thinkers and writers. . . . In the latter of these classes may be mentioned Frederick Faber, J. D. Dalgairns, and W. G. Ward, men who have all since risen to eminence in their different spheres' (pp. 204-5).

The last named of these was eager and impetuous, a singularly able logician, with no real care for the Church of England, or loyalty for her, but anxious to test her and see what amount of what he held to be Catholic truth she would tolerate. Perpetually with Newman, whom he regarded as his special teacher, he was for ever pushing him on in a Romeward direction. To oppose this seemed to be Isaac Williams's special mission ; and throughout, the *Autobiography* testifies to his constant fears of the result, and his anxious foreboding of what he dreaded might happen. Thus he writes :

'Nothing had as yet impaired my friendship with Newman. We lived daily very much together ; but I had a secret uneasiness, not from anything said or implied, but from a want of repose about his character, that I thought he would start into some line different from Keble and Pusey, though I knew not in what direction it would be. Often when walking together, when leaving him, have I heard a deep sigh which I could not interpret. It seemed to speak of weariness of the world, and of aspirations for something he wished to do and had not yet done. Of the putting out of Church principles he often spoke as of an experiment which he did not know whether the Church of England would bear, and knew not what would be the issue' (pp. 101-2). 'Many have naturally supposed that it was the condemnation of the Tract No. 90 by the Heads of Houses which gave his sensitive mind the decided turn to the Church of Rome. But I remember circumstances which indicated it was not so. He talked to me of writing a tract on the Thirty-nine Articles, and at the same

time said things in favour of the Church of Rome which quite startled and alarmed me, and I was afraid he would express the same in this tract, with no idea (as his manner was) of the sensation it would occasion. After endeavouring to dissuade him from it, I said, "Well, at all events let me see it first" (p. 108). 'His decided leaning to Rome came out to me in private before that tract was written. Certainly he felt neglected before by the University, and constantly irritated by the Head of his college; and I used to be surprised he had not more learned to look on persecution as a matter of course, what a good man must expect to meet with, and which should be to him a satisfaction, as indicating him to be in the way of truth. Yet nothing had as yet impaired our intimacy and friendship, until one evening, when alone in his rooms, he told me he thought the Church of Rome was right, and we were wrong, so much so that we ought to join it.' . . . 'This conversation grieved and amazed me, and I at once wrote and gave Newman to understand that we could not be together so much as we had been. I owed it to myself. I had no right to put myself into temptation; to subject myself willingly to influences which must operate so powerfully on the mind (for what could be more attractive than such influence?), and thus to be led to what I was now assured was wrong. Yet still nothing of the nature of ill-will or a quarrel arose between us' (pp. 109-11).

And as showing the kind of theological atmosphere in which Newman was living, we have the following:

'It was a great relief to me at that time, when I knew not how far our mutual friends agreed with Newman, that John Bowden—Newman's oldest and best friend—took me aside and thanked me greatly for the way I had spoken in *The Baptistry* against Rome, saying that Oxford, which had always been before his most delightful retreat, was now becoming painful to him from the Romanizing tendencies in some of our friends. Yet still all this was long before it was publicly known what Newman's thoughts really were; and he was for some time accused by some of dishonesty and duplicity' (p. 112).

Whilst speaking thus openly of the Romanizing tendencies of Newman for some years before he left the Church of England, this *Autobiography* makes it very clear that with the great majority of those who took part in writing the *Tracts for the Times* there was the most complete loyalty to our Church. Mr. Williams writes:

'It seems to be a popular notion that the original writers of the *Tracts* have generally joined the Church of Rome, and that therefore that movement of itself has been so far a failure; but this is very far from being the case, for it is a very remarkable circumstance, and one which I find very much strikes every one to whom I have mentioned it, that out of all the writers in the *Tracts for the Times* one only has joined the Church of Rome. And another remarkable fact is, that whereas those writers are sometimes popularly said to have been of

the  
this v  
appea  
betwe  
slight  
and I  
Thom  
Pusey  
(auth  
Prevot

T  
St. Pa

'A  
not, to  
Pusey,  
Rome,  
Mober  
Mr. Is  
a cent  
in the  
learned  
James  
of the  
Oxford  
Roman  
judgm  
made t  
the rul  
in the  
wrong,  
all will  
Oxford  
men' (

Th  
bare, a  
of the  
of wha  
graphe  
away,  
biograp  
much-l  
it is to  
yet be  
foes of  
views c  
of the

the Evangelical school, the only one, I believe, who was so was this very one who has joined the Roman Church. From which it appears that there is standing-ground in the Church of England between these two extremes. Of all who took any part, however slight and trivial, in the *Tracts for the Times*, I can make out fourteen, and I do not think there were any more—Froude, Newman, John and Thomas Keble, Arthur Perceval, John Bowden, Isaac Williams, Pusey, Benjamin Harrison (since Archdeacon), William Palmer (author of the *Origines Liturgicæ*), Thomas Mozley, Sir George Prevost, Antony Buller, and R. J. Wilson' (p. 120).

This is thoroughly confirmed by what the late Dean of St. Paul's says :

'Anglicanism itself was not Roman; friends and foes said it was not, to reproach as well as to defend it. It was not Roman in Dr. Pusey, though he was not afraid to acknowledge what was good in Rome. It was not Roman in Mr. Keble and his friends, in Dr. Moberly of Winchester and the Barthers. It was not Roman in Mr. Isaac Williams, Mr. Copeland, and Mr. Woodgate, each of them a centre of influence in Oxford and the country. It was not Roman in the devoted Charles Marriott, or in Isaac Williams' able and learned pupil, Mr. Arthur Haddan. It was not Roman in Mr. James Mozley, after Mr. Newman the most forcible and impressive of the Oxford writers. A distinctively English party grew up, both in Oxford and away from it, strong in eminent names, in proportion as Roman sympathies showed themselves. These men were, in any fair judgment, as free from Romanising as any of their accusers; but they made their appeal for patience and fair judgment in vain. If only the rulers could have had patience—but patience is a difficult virtue in the presence of what seem pressing dangers. Their policy was wrong, stupid, unjust, pernicious. It was a deplorable mistake, and all will wish now that the discredit of it did not rest on the history of Oxford. And yet it was the mistake of upright and conscientious men' (pp. 292-3).

The internal history of the movement has now been laid bare, and we have seen the inmost workings of the thoughts of the hearts of those who took part in it, as well as the story of what they did, portrayed by themselves or their biographers. The chief actors in what was then done have passed away, and there remain but two of them to have their biography written. Dr. Pusey's *Life*, commenced by the much-lamented Dr. Liddon, will, we trust, soon appear; and it is to be hoped that a more worthy life of John Keble will yet be given to us than we at present possess. Friends and foes of a somewhat later generation are now giving their views of the character of at least one of the chief promoters of the Oxford Movement. And if Dr. Abbott seeks to be-

little Newman, and with microscopic diligence to hunt out and bring into the fullest light of day the inconsistencies of which he was guilty, and the mistakes into which he fell, and the want of a definite principle to guide his action by which his leadership was marked, and the exaggerated extent to which thought of his own personal salvation blinded him to other considerations, we have in Mr. R. H. Hutton's interesting and appreciative biography the warm and admiring views of one who felt how much of his spiritual life he owed to him whose biography he was writing.

In the full glare of light which has been thrown upon the authors of the Oxford Movement, which has so vitally affected the Church of England, we feel that whilst mistakes were made, that whilst the chief earlier leader and some of his immediate followers lacked faith and loyalty in the Church whose defenders they intended to be, there is nevertheless little that will not bear the closest scrutiny. We believe that all were actuated by high religious motive, that all had a single desire to be true and faithful servants of the one great Master, and that for His sake they were at all times ready to make any sacrifice. Much as we lament the course that some of them eventually pursued, we feel that it would be unworthy prejudice that could hinder us from making this acknowledgement to the men by whose good work we believe that the Church of England has been so signally benefited.

---

#### ART. V.—RELIGIOUS EQUALITY: THE BITTER CRY OF DISSENTING CLERICALISM.

*Bicentenary Lectures.* By PRINCIPAL FAIRBAIRN, M.A., D.D.; J. GUINNESS ROGERS, B.A.; J. CARVELL WILLIAMS; A. MACKENNAL, B.A., D.D.; and C. A. Berry. (London, 1889.)

THE Dissenters used formerly to tell the English people that religion and politics, the Christian Society and the National Commonwealth, have no inherent relation to one another. The State, or Commonwealth, notwithstanding the strong language of the Apostle of the Nations in his letter to the Church of Rome, was confounded by them with that 'World' against which the Church is obliged to be at war. The union between 'Church and Commonwealth'—a phrase which occurs

so of  
men  
scho  
John  
holy  
State  
the C  
begin  
hold,  
by th  
the C  
could  
saint  
union  
ing o  
not e  
detac  
power  
thoug  
effect  
which  
of G  
exodu  
Evang  
these  
so the  
truly  
becau  
but by  
and th  
Th  
that M  
tion of  
basis  
Church  
parish  
regard  
by the  
individ  
baptism  
discipli  
The  
Church  
catchw  
signs o

so often in the language of our English monarchs and parliaments, and in the charters of our old English free grammar schools—was declared by the Dissenters, as the late Mr. John Bright said, to be 'adulterous.' The Church, if she be holy, ought to be divorced from so unholy a husband as the State. When the earlier Dissenters called for the divorce of the Church from the State, they held that the action must begin with the Church, and must be religious. They did not hold, as our Dissenters do, that the action should be begun by the State, and be political. They urged the members of the Church—as least, so many members of the Church as they could allow to be the elect, the converted, the godly, the saints, the sound in faith—themselves to break the adulterous union, by separating from the parish congregation and joining one of the 'evangelical' sects. The older Dissenters did not expect that the worldly State would of its own motion detach itself from the Church, or renounce so profitable a power as 'the patronage and control of religion.' They thought that the Church and the State could only be effectually 'separated' by a *Massenaustritt*, such as that to which Johann Most some years ago called the wage-workers of Germany. As the German Anarchist pleaded for the exodus of all working men and women from the Catholic and Evangelical Churches of the German Empire, because both these Churches were defiled by their relation to 'Kapitalismus,' so the English Dissenters formerly urged the exodus of all truly religious men and women from the English Church, because she was defiled, not merely by her 'Sacerdotalism,' but by the relation in which she stood to the secular parishes and the nation.

The Catholic Church has in all ages and places rejected that Manichæan conception of the Father's secular organization of mankind into nations and communes which lay at the basis of the earlier English 'Anti-State Churchism.' The Church has sought union with nations, and union with parishes, as she has sought union with families, because she regarded them as secular 'congregations' gathered into one by the providence of the Father in world-history and over individual lives, and so prepared by Him for incorporation by baptism into the Church of His Son, and for education by the discipline which He gave to His Apostles for 'all nations.'

The rejection of the old Dissenting phrase, 'Anti-State Church,' and the adoption in its stead of the new Dissenting catchword, 'Liberation,' seems to us to be one of the many signs of the inherent 'Decay of Dissent.' All educated

Separatists in our generation now agree with the Church in rejecting this Manichæan tradition of their fathers as to the State. They accept that view of God's social organization of mankind which has always been maintained by the Church, and which accounts for the historical disposition and distinction of the 'one body' of the Catholic Church into National Churches—a distinction which even the Roman Papacy has been powerless to ignore. The Dissenters have discovered that the Commonwealth in England, as in Israel, is the work of the same God who made the Church, and so cannot reasonably be described as a thing in its nature contrary to the Church. The State, like the family, or like the local commune (out of which States are evolved), is, indeed, a society different from the Church; but it is not contrary to it, nor incapable of being allied with it. The main difference between the Church and the State as social organisms is that the Church is 'one body,' with 'one baptism' and 'one faith,' and is the same throughout all States, all parishes, and all families; whereas States, parishes, and families are many bodies, although they also have a secular unity in that common humanity which the Church recognizes and educates.

Hence our present-day Dissenters, who can no longer cry out against the union of the Christian society with the civil society as worldly and irreligious, but cannot yet reconcile themselves to the historical relation between the English Church and Commonwealth, have been driven to seek for a new cry. They have found it in the political cry for what they call 'Religious Equality'—a gift which the Catholic Church is always offering to all nations and every conscience, a gift which the founders of Calvinist Dissent said God had reserved for their aristocracy of 'the elect,' and which the founders of Methodist Dissent said He had reserved for their aristocracy of 'the converted,' but which the Church had democratically witnessed to be His gift through baptism to all. The modern Dissenters regard Parliament alone as the keeper of this precious gift. As the Nonconformists cried to Parliament to give them 'Comprehension,' as the Separatists (Independents, Baptists, Quakers, Roman Catholics) cried to Parliament to give them 'Toleration,' so the Liberationists cry to Parliament to give them 'Religious Equality.' The thing they mean by it is a kind of gift which the Catholic Church by her very character cannot give, which cannot with any great degree of piety be asked from God, but can only be obtained from sovereigns and parliaments. The appeal of the Dissenters to Parliament for the gift of what they call 'Religious Equality'

sho  
fore  
men  
Nor  
thei  
(tho  
men  
(wh  
that  
adv  
in V  
'  
'tha  
of th  
may  
gove  
Aga  
'Rel  
B. of  
sup  
pref  
land  
Libe  
of Pa  
'  
nothi  
referr  
Bisho  
maint  
what  
order  
you m  
nation  
Convo  
the Ch  
rob yo  
'  
in the  
So in  
Rump  
tion'  
membe  
with re  
... Y  
which  
Sermo  
J. Row  
at Wes



shows that, in whatever other points they differ from their foregoers, they have lost none of that Erastian faith in Parliaments which has been a prominent characteristic of English Nonconformity and English Dissent throughout all stages of their history. John Penry, the idol of our Welsh Liberationists (though they do not seem to have read his writings) told the members of Elizabeth's Parliament in 1588 that they were (what the Prussian kings claim to be) *Summus Episcopus*, and that it was their proper function to disestablish 'the old adversaries (bishops, I mean),' and to establish Nonconformity in Wales.<sup>1</sup>

'Believe not them who tell you,' said Penry to the Parliament, 'that it belongeth not unto your duties to be carefull of the estate of the Church, and that the Lord requireth nothing of you but the mayntenance of outward peace, as though men committed to your government were but drooves of brute beasts' (p. 16).

Again, he urged upon the Parliament to establish his ideal of 'Religious Equality' by disestablishing and disendowing 'the B. of Landaff, Davids, Asaph, and Bangor,' because 'they claime superiority over their fellow brethren, as Ministers,' and 'are preferred before many godly and learned Ministers in this land' (p. 31). That Penry was as persuaded as any modern Liberationist can be that it was within the power and right of Parliament to confer this gift is evident from his appeal:—

'I hope it wil not be here said, That the Parliament can doe nothing in the matter, because hytherto all Church causes have been referred unto the Convocation-house, and the leaders thereof, the Bishops. And doe you mean it shall still be so? Then shall you maintaine these horrible profanations of God's sanctuarie. For what assembly is there in the land that dare challenge unto itself the ordering of Religion if Parliament may not? When you say, That you may not deale in the matters of Religion, because the determinations of that cause are referred to the Bishops assembled in their Convocation-house, who in their canons are to provide and see that the Church be not in a decayed state, do you not thereby thinke you rob yourselves of your Own Prerogative and liberties?' (pp. 44, 45).

<sup>1</sup> *A Viewe of some part of such Publike Wants and Disorders as are in the Service of GOD in her Majesties Countrie of Wales* (Preface). 1588. So in 1653 the most popular Independent preacher in London under the Rump Commonwealth, William Strong, who had a 'gathered congregation' in Westminster Abbey, of which many 'Parliament-men' were members, said, 'It shall be told you that it belongs not to you to meddle with religion; your power is only in things civil, being a civil magistrate. . . . You, right honourable, with the rest in authority, ought to judge which is the true religion, and to endeavour to maintain it.'—*Select Sermons Preached on Special Occasions* (edited by T. Manton, and by J. Rowe, Strong's fanatical successor as 'Publick Preacher of the Abbey at Westminster'), 1656, pp. 27, 28.

It is certainly not within the power of any Parliament or any Cæsar to create religious equality by the force of law. But it is undoubtedly within the power of a Parliament to bestow upon Dissenting ministers the thing which they really mean by 'Religious Equality.' It needs no prophet to foresee that all the politicians who want to catch the votes of the meeting-houses, and all the newspaper-men who want their custom, are sure to adopt this bitter cry of Dissenting 'Clericalism,' though few will spend five minutes in asking what the cry ought to mean, what religion is, what equality is, or what the connexion is between the two.

The Liberationists have been declaiming for so many years about 'Religious Equality' that we ought by this time to know all they mean by it. It is not unimportant to remember that they are not the inventors of the phrase. The phrase itself is now about a century old. It seems first to have been used, so far as we can discover, by J. W. Morris, the biographer of the eminent Baptist minister, Andrew Fuller. He discharged it as a catapult against Dissenting ministers. He accused the ministers of the 'Free Churches,' and not the English clergy, nor the English State, of sinning against 'Religious Equality.'

Andrew Fuller had received from some American co-religionists, who were eager to show their admiration for his great gifts and high character, the honorary degree of a Doctor in Divinity. He refused the title, and gave two reasons for his refusal. First, he said that he could make no pretensions to such a range of scholarship as is presupposed to belong to those upon whom Universities generally confer the degree. Secondly, he declared that even if he could have flattered himself that he merited the diploma offered him by the College of New Jersey, he should nevertheless decline to accept it, 'because,' as he wrote, 'I believe all such Titles in Religion to be contrary to our Lord's command in Matthew xxiii. 8.' His biographer says that Fuller 'amused himself with its pompous contents;' but that he

'considered such an appendage as little short of ridiculous, when attached to men whose utmost acquirements do not go beyond the rudiments of general literature. He also entertained objection on higher grounds, deeming it incompatible with that *Religious Equality* which Christ *established* among His disciples, by calling them brethren.'

It is evident, by the feverish anxiety for academical degrees amongst modern Dissenters, and by their removal of two of their own sectarian colleges to Oxford, that they have

small  
of the  
those  
sente  
blishe  
or a p  
Bapti  
Religi  
for an  
above  
tingu  
Spurg  
it, hav  
the n  
Bapti  
ment  
O  
Fuller  
spirit.  
catch  
pulpit  
portat  
habit  
cally  
which  
der M  
equal  
alread  
give i  
their  
social  
minis  
Cæsar  
T  
to ack  
and t  
the C  
leyan  
tivists  
the F  
'Chur  
abstra  
and e

small desire for 'Religious Equality' in Andrew Fuller's sense of the phrase. The thing which is meant by it amongst those whom Defoe called 'State Dissenters, or Politick Dissenters,'<sup>1</sup> and whom we call Liberationists, was never 'established' by Christ, but can only be 'established' by a Cæsar or a parliament. It is certain that Fuller's successors in the Baptist ministry will not petition parliament to 'establish Religious Equality' in Fuller's sense of it: they will not call for an Act forbidding any Dissenting preacher to exalt himself above his brethren by calling himself 'D.D.' The most distinguished minister of Fuller's persuasion, the late Mr. Spurgeon, might at any time, if he had expressed a wish for it, have obtained a Doctorship of Divinity from America by the next mail. But his superiority to his colleagues in the Baptist ministry was too obvious to need any such advertisement that they were not his equals.

Our modern Liberationists have adopted the phrase of Fuller and Morris in the letter, though they reject it in the spirit. They give two very different meanings to the new catchword, 'Religious Equality,' when they use it in the pulpit, the newspapers, or the political meeting. It is important to distinguish these two meanings, for they are in the habit of confounding them. First, they mean by it theoretically the complete equality before the law of every society which calls itself a 'Church'—like the 'Gleichberechtigung der Konfessionen' of the German States. This kind of equality, so far as their conception of a 'Church' admits, they already really have. They have no need to ask the State to give it to them. Secondly, they mean practically by it, as all their instances and grievances clearly show, the official and social equality of all persons who call themselves 'Christian ministers.' This sort of equality it is impossible for any Cæsar or Parliament to bestow upon them.

The English Commonwealth (this is their theory) ought to acknowledge no distinction between the Plymouth Brethren and the branch of the Roman Papacy in England; between the Church of England and any of the 'Churches' of Wesleyan Methodism; between the Independents and the Positivists; between the Baptists and the Unitarians; between the Presbyterians and the Quakers; or between any one 'Church' and any other 'Church.' Nevertheless, while in the abstract they extend the right of 'Religious Equality' to any and every society which calls itself a 'Church,' whenever they

<sup>1</sup> *An Inquiry into Occasional Conformity*, ed. 1703.

deal with this right in the concrete they confine it to those 'Churches' which have official 'ministers,' and they virtually deny the right of 'Religious Equality' to those sects which are non-clericalist, or are anti-clericalist, or in which every member is or may be a 'minister.' Hence the demand for 'Religious Equality' is a matter of great urgency to the Presbyterian, Independent, Baptist, and Wesleyan 'Churches;' but it is a matter of scarcely any moment to the Quaker, Plymouth Brethren, or the various new 'Churches' gathered by Revivalist preachers. It is in fact the bitter cry of Clericalist 'Dissent,' and it is therefore a mere class cry. 'In America,' said an Independent minister who has 'occupied' a pulpit on both sides of the Atlantic, 'they call us all clergymen.' So 'Clericalist Equality' would more fitly express the gift which they ask the State to bestow upon them than 'Religious Equality' does; for while they suppose that a parliamentary vote can lift up the Rev. J. G. Rogers to the level of the Bishop of London, they do not seem to hold that it can raise a Plymouth Brother, or a woman-preacher amongst the Quakers, or a Salvationist she-captain, to the level of the Rev. J. G. Rogers. They do not want the Parliament to establish 'Religious Equality' between all 'Churches,' but only between the clergy of the National Church and the preachers of a limited number of historical sects which have an official and paid class of ministers. They ask that such sects shall be State-favoured.

Neither do they really look upon this 'Religious Equality,' as Andrew Fuller did, as a 'religious' thing, and so as already existing, and capable of being enjoyed. They hold it rather to be a social and political thing not yet existing, and incapable of being brought about by religious means, but capable only of being created by an Act of Parliament disestablishing and disendowing the National bishops, priests, and deacons. It is only just to say that they do not now ask the State to establish and endow them—as the Long Parliament established and endowed Nonconformist ministers in the English parishes, and as the Rump 'Commonwealth' and the Cromwellian Empire established Separatist, Independent, and Baptist ministers alongside of the Presbyterian ministers in the English parishes, or as William III. established and endowed the Nonconformist ministry in Scotland. But that which the Liberationists demand from the State is really establishment without endowment. The English nation, ever since it has been a nation, has never yet acknowledged that there is more than one English Church, which is the entirety

of  
dea  
been  
befo  
has,  
Libe  
or I  
mon  
of a  
their  
of '  
estab  
its o  
folk  
betw  
the  
Eng  
'Sta  
and  
?  
justi  
exist  
can  
mem  
the C  
Chur  
creat  
by b  
sect,  
'sain  
of th  
reno  
relig  
comm  
bless  
cong  
other  
M  
the C  
natio  
thou  
throu  
tion  
1  
1889,

of the baptized in England, with their bishops, priests, and deacons. The question between Rome and us has always been—Who are the rightful ministers of this Church, which, before the Reformation, throughout it, and after it, had, and has, the same unchanged name, *Ecclesia Anglicana*. But the Liberationists (who, indeed, seem mostly to be Scotch, Welsh, or Irish, rather than English) demand that the English Commonwealth shall abolish by law the oldest and most national of all her traditions, and substitute for it, by Act of Parliament, their new American or French-Swiss notion of any number of 'Free Churches.' For they ask the State to adopt and establish their definition of a 'Church' and of 'Churches' as its own definition. They ask the State to compel the English folk to accept their own sectarian theory of the right relation between 'the Churches' and the Commonwealth. They ask the State to declare by a positive law that the historical English Church and any or every sect (or, as they say, the 'State-Church' and the 'Free Churches') are equally, alike, and in exactly the same sense 'Churches.'

The Rev. J. G. Rogers informs the nation that 'Political justice requires everywhere that between the different *Churches* existing in the same nation there should be equality.'<sup>1</sup> How can the State create equality where the unit, or the Church-member, is so different and contrary as it is and must be in the Catholic Church and in a sect separated from the Catholic Church? In the Church the unit is democratic—'every creature;' there is not a soul in any parish who is not capable by baptism of being a member of the Church. But in the sect, or 'Free Church,' the unit is aristocratic—the 'elect,' the 'saint,' the 'truly converted;' the one who is unlike the rest of the parish is alone capable of membership. The Dissenter renounces all 'Religious Equality,' and he asserts his own religious superiority, when he withdraws himself from the communion with 'the mixed multitude of the parish assemblies,' as the founders of Independency called the actual congregations of the Church, and joins himself to one or other of 'the Churches.'

Mr. Rogers thinks that the historical difference between the Church and the Sects is a thing too unimportant for the nation to heed. He says that the Church and the Sects—though the Church stands upon the saving relation of God through Jesus Christ to *all* men, and the Sect upon His relation only to *some* men—are separated not so much by dif-

<sup>1</sup> 'Two Christian Peoples in One Nation.' *Bicentenary Lectures*, 1889, p. 124.

ferences of doctrine or polity, as by the arbitrary line which the State has drawn.'<sup>1</sup> On this point, however, the Dissenting advocates of 'Religious Equality' speak with an uncertain voice, and contradict one another. The whole blame for the under-valuation of Dissenting ministers is thrown by some upon the Commonwealth, as it is here by Mr. Rogers. But others, who are less tolerant and good-humoured than he is, assert that it is not the State but the Church which is the sinner. Dr. Clifford, Dr. Fairbairn, the Rev. H. P. Hughes, Mr. Horton, and others are never weary of telling the nation that 'Priestism,' or 'Sacerdotalism,' is really the difference which separates the Church of England from the Sects, or that 'the figment of apostolical succession' is the one distinctive mark which sunders the State-favoured from the State-ignored 'ministers,' and makes 'Religious Equality' impossible. Certainly 'Sacerdotalism' is both 'doctrine' and 'polity,' and is not 'a line which the State has drawn,' or is likely to draw.

These Liberationists consequently ought to demand that the State (what implicitly they do demand) shall make 'Religious Equality' a law by abolishing 'Sacerdotalism.' That is to say, that Parliament should force upon every bishop, priest, deacon, and layman (so far as it can) the sectarian 'clericalist' theory of 'the Christian ministry'—namely, that there is no difference (except the possession or non-possession of a D.D.) between one 'minister' and another 'minister.' Such an Act of Parliamentary 'Religious Equality' would strike at the Pope's clergy, as well as at the National clergy, and so would hit their own political allies, who love the Church of England as little as they do. But the State can hardly be expected by the most sanguine fanatic to go such lengths in the establishment of Liberationist 'Religious Equality' as not only to disestablish the National clergy, but also to prohibit the disestablished National bishops and the Pope's bishops from claiming to be successors of the Apostles, or from ordaining some ministers as 'priests' and others as deacons, who by Catholic ordination are robbed of their religious equality with the ministers called priests. The modern State dare not go such lengths in persecution as Cromwell's monstrous 'Instrument of Government,' and include 'Popery and Prelacy' in a common proscription.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'Two Christian Peoples in One Nation.' *Bicentenary Lectures*, 1889, p. 124.

<sup>2</sup> 'Such as profess faith in God by Jesus Christ, though differing in judgment from the doctrine, worship, or discipline publicly held forth, shall not be restrained from, but shall be protected in, the profession of

T  
'Reli  
symp  
as to  
of E  
that  
bapti  
such  
every  
stand  
doctr  
of E  
paris  
not h  
The  
leade  
whom  
and  
Chur  
him  
of t  
and  
depe  
of C  
peop  
from  
rema  
ther  
of th  
the  
the f  
to th  
peace  
nor  
of th  
magi  
Turk  
of th  
Will  
'Inst  
and  
able  
Hea  
relig  
dota  
Com  
whic  
1



The most curious fact about this Liberationist doctrine of 'Religious Equality,' as we have already hinted, is that it is a symptom of the 'Decay of Dissent.' Mr. Rogers is so liberal as to concede that the State may lawfully regard the Church of England as 'a Church;' that she is one of 'the Churches;' that she is as really a 'Church' as any Independent or Anabaptist segregation from her is. He does not see that by such a concession he is undermining the ground upon which every Independent 'Church' was built, and upon which it still stands. For if the founders of Independency had held the doctrine of Mr. Rogers, if they had believed that the Church of England was indeed a 'Church,' or that any one of her parishes was really a 'Congregation,' there would not and could not have been any such societies as Independent 'Churches.' The founders of the sect in which Mr. Rogers is a distinguished leader, if he will refer to them, will tell him that the persons whom he segregates from the parish congregation of Clapham and other parishes compose a true 'Church' because the Church of England is not really a Church. They will tell him that he and his people are not schismatics, because none of the parochial congregations from whose communion he and his people are segregated are really 'Churches.' The Independent 'fathers' will also tell him that if the 'parish church of Clapham be really a "church," then he and his separated people are schismatical, and not a Church.' 'For separation from a Church rightly constituted, or from a true Church so remaining,' said John Robinson, 'I do utterly disclaim it. For there is but one body, the Church, and but one Lord or Head of that body, Christ. And whosoever separates from the body the Church, separates from the Head Christ, in that respect.'<sup>1</sup>

the faith and exercise of their religion, so as they abuse not this liberty to the civil injury of others, and to the actual disturbance of the public peace on their parts: provided this liberty be not extended to Popery nor Prelacy' (art. 37, *Mercurius Politicus*, December 29, 1653). One of the State's Independent chaplains, Dr. John Owen, said that 'the magistrate is to remove the Papists' images, altars, pictures, and the like, Turks' mosques, and Prelates' service-book' ('Of Toleration and the Duty of the Magistrate about Religion,' Owen's *Works*, xvi. 238). Another, William Strong, had demanded a few weeks before the publication of the 'Instrument' that 'Popery, as a religion,' should not 'receive a toleration and the same countenance that others do, it being a religion most agreeable to nature, as corrupt, and so exactly fitted to it' (*A Voice from Heaven*, preached before the Lord Mayor at Paul's, p. 21). It was the religious and not the political character of these two forms of 'sacerdotalism' which had excluded them from toleration under the Rump Commonwealth, and was still to exclude them under the new empire which Cromwell set up on the ruins of that Commonwealth.

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, ii. 259.

So all the early doctors of Congregationalist Independency—Brown, Barrowe, Greenwood, and Penry—held it to be a grievous schism to separate from any true ‘Church.’ There might be within the Church of England, as the fathers of Independency said, persons who were joined personally though not ecclesiastically to Christ, who were ‘saints,’ God’s ‘elect,’ and a portion of ‘the people of God ;’ but the English Church herself was ‘Babylon,’ notwithstanding such Israelites being in her. Hence the call of God to all such persons was, ‘Come ye out of her, My People,’ join yourselves by a covenant with a true visible Church. Any ‘Religious Equality’ between the National Church and a Congregationalist ‘Church,’ or between parish priests and Independent ministers, would have seemed to the founders of Independency a concord between Antichrist and Christ. The Lord, as Henry Barrowe said in 1591, cannot possibly have two Churches. If ‘the parish-assembly’ be a Church, those who separate from it are no Church. If those who separate be a Church, those who remain in communion cannot be a Church. ‘For sure Christ standeth not a Head to two so diverse Bodies, which have so diverse and strange members, functions, powers.’ Hence he concluded that if the Church of England could be properly called a Church, then the Brownist or Independent segregations from her ‘parish-assemblies, the ‘Free Churches’ of Liberationism, must be schisms and no Churches at all.

For ‘they have,’ said he, ‘another and quite diverse ministerie and Church-offices, another choyce and ordination : another worship and ministration : another Church-government, orders, and ordinances. These, I am sure, are no variable and indifferent things, such as Churches may safely differ in, and yet *the one and the other* be held and esteemed true established Churches. Christ hath left unto His Church in all places unto the world’s end but one and the same ministrie, ministration, worship, and government.’<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Rogers will see that the Church of England is much more true to this ‘principle’ of Independency, as it is here stated, than he himself is, though he is far more tolerant of our ministry than Barrowe was. For Mr. Rogers holds that the State ought to tolerate our ministry as well as his own ; whereas Barrowe and Penry both held that the State ought not to tolerate Whitgift’s and Hooker’s ministry as well as theirs. ‘Wee conclude,’ said Barrowe, ‘that the bishops be Antichristian, and that whosoever is ordayned by them hath his ministerie from Antichrist and from the Devil’ (p. 115).

<sup>1</sup> *A Plaine Refutation*, 1591, p. 240.

Penry  
lastin  
ligiou  
archb  
Italia  
teach

T  
baptis  
any s  
receiv  
must  
he co  
point  
tism,  
ough  
dinati  
must  
it was  
some  
were  
show  
Lord  
stigmat  
Indep  
the w  
Robin  
yet c  
was t  
whom  
again  
formi  
of En  
'of be  
and c  
Engla  
is alw

'Y  
collect  
the co  
[into h  
tent.  
and ne  
overth

<sup>1</sup> V  
<sup>2</sup> A  
lishma

Penry again and again threatened the Parliament with everlasting damnation unless it established his form of 'Religious Equality' by abolishing the Antichristian offices of archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, etc.—'those filthy Italian weedles,' and by setting up the Calvinist 'pastors and teachers' in their stead.

The founders of English Independency and English Anabaptism both agreed that the Church of England was not in any sense a 'Church.' They both agreed that the ministry received in it was no ministry, and that ordination by a bishop must be 'renounced' by any man who had received it before he could be accepted as the minister of a true 'Church.' The point on which the two sects differed were whether the baptism, as well as the ordination, received in the English Church ought to be renounced. The Independents said that the ordination of the minister must be renounced, but that baptism must be retained, because baptism was 'a vessel of God, though it was in Babylon,' and it might be brought out of it. So some in the Church of England, though they were in Babylon, were nevertheless 'God's people,' said Robinson, 'as not a few show themselves to be,' he added, 'by coming out of it at the Lord's call.' By the 'Lord's call' he meant the sectarian instigation of an Independent preacher. So impossible is it for Independency to grant what Mr. Rogers grants, that, 'though the whole Church of England and every member in it,' said Robinson, 'did personally profess the true faith in holiness, yet could not this make it or them a true Church.'<sup>1</sup> This was the argument by which Defoe, the ablest champion whom the Dissenters ever had, embittered his co-religionists against him during the controversies upon 'Occasional Conformity.' To conform for one single occasion to the Church of England, he said, 'for the sake of a piece of preferment,' or 'of being mayors, aldermen, jurists, and sheriffs of the towns and corporations,' is virtually to concede that the Church of England is a Church, and therefore that communion with her is always, and on all occasions, lawful.

'Yet,' added he, 'by the very constitution and foundation of a collected *Separate* Church or congregation, no man can go back to the communion of the Church of England, and be received again [into his own "Church"] upon any other condition but as a penitent. 'Tis an act destructive of all possible pretence for Dissenting, and never was, nor never can be, defended by any Dissenter, without overthrowing all the reasons they could ever give for Dissenting.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, ii. 479, 480.

<sup>2</sup> *A Collection of the Writings of the Author of the True-Born Englishman*, 1703, p. 169.

So Defoe reminds the modern Liberationists that their concession of the name and rights of 'a Church' to the Church of England (though it may be a pleasing evidence of their own growth in toleration, or the sign of a revolution in their theology) 'overthrows all the reasons they could ever give' for calling either of their separated societies 'a Church.' The only possible justification for the 'gathering' of a Congregationalist 'Church' out of the parish churches, or out of a number of parish churches (as Brown, Barrowe, Greenwood, Penry, Robinson, and all the fathers of Independency contended), is, not that the 'parish-assemblies,' the local fellowships of the baptized in the Church of England are faulty and imperfect 'Churches,' as the Liberationist now concedes them to be: but it is that they are no Churches at all, and that it is, therefore, the duty of every 'Christian' to separate from all Churchmen, lay or clerical, and have no communion with them. 'There is nothing to be expected from Christ for any member of the Church of England,' said De Cluse, 'but a pouring out of His eternal wrath upon them.'<sup>1</sup>

Thus, as we have already hinted, the cry of the modern Liberationists to the State to give them 'Religious Equality' is a symptom of the inward 'Decay of Dissent.' If they were in the habit of going back to the old paths, if they knew anything of the history of their own sects, if they did not substitute legends and traditions for critical research, if they could spare a little time from political agitation, they would see that they are asking the State to decree by Act of Parliament that the founders of Independency and Anabaptism were in the wrong. For what they require is a dogmatic parliamentary decree—like the decree of the Long Parliament on Ordination in 1648—that there is no difference between the Church of England and the various English Sects, or 'Free Churches,' and no difference between Anglican 'Sacerdotalists' and true 'Ministers of the Gospel,' except such as the State alone can and ought to expunge—'the arbitrary line,' says Mr. Rogers, 'which the State has drawn.'

It will strike some observers as an eccentric and ironical twist of the whirligig of time that the Liberationists should have become so Erastian. The 'Anti-State-Church' party at the beginning of its history assumed the Church and the State to be two alien bodies, and there is still some faint

<sup>1</sup> See Hansard Knollys Society's *Tracts on Liberty of Conscience*, p. 156. In a dialogue between 'Christian,' 'Antichristian,' and 'Indifferent man' this statement is said by 'Christian' to be 'according to truth.' The title 'Christian' is used as a synonym for Anabaptist.

sur  
of F  
Yet  
the  
that  
of I  
natio  
Cæsa  
is a  
Ana  
othe  
the S  
wide  
Cron  
natio  
by a  
Cong  
and  
adelp  
Socie  
A  
of po  
Equal  
the I  
legal  
stood  
theor  
does  
'the  
of E  
comm  
that c  
of 'th  
and I  
repres  
is nov  
to be  
the 'C  
or ant  
of the  
favour  
Th  
comes  
are 'C  
They  
VOL

survival of their old theory in their new cry for the 'Liberation of Religion from the control and patronage of the State.' Yet they now attribute a kind of ecclesiastical infallibility to the State. For what less are they doing when they insist that it is the State which must define and decide, by an Act of Parliament, which of the religious societies within the nation are truly and equally 'Churches'; when they petition Cæsar to decree that in whatever sense the Church of England is a 'Church,' in that sense Presbyterianism, Independency, Anabaptism, the variations of Methodism, and possibly some other sects are also 'Churches'? The Erastian capacities of the State in matters of religion have never been stretched so widely, or asserted so boldly, since the day when Oliver Cromwell made himself 'Summus Episcopus' of the three nations. If Parliament has the power and right to decree by an Act, as the Liberationists now assume it has, that Congregationalism is a 'Church,' it must also have the power and right to decree that the Salvation Army, the Christadelphian Synagogue, the Plymouth Brethren, and the Secular Society are 'Churches.'

All who have any practical acquaintance with the course of political life are aware that the abstract theory of 'Religious Equality,' and the Separatist definition of 'a Church'—which the Liberationists now ask the State to establish as its own legal theory and its own legal definition, can only be understood by their concrete applications and illustrations of the theory and the definition. The cry for 'Religious Equality' does not come from all Dissenters, from all the sects, from all 'the Free Churches.' We must not ignore the present aspect of English Sectarianism. In spite of the boast of 'our common Nonconformity,' Dissent no longer possesses even that degree of negative unity which it had when the deputies of 'the Three Denominations' (Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists) could justly appear before the State as the representatives of 'the Dissenting Interest.' English Dissent is now split into two competing halves which are not likely to be reconciled: (1) The sects which have official ministers, the 'Clericalist' sects; (2) the sects which are non-clericalist or anti-clericalist, and correspond to the 'anti-ministerialists' of the Commonwealth period, who were the terror of the State-favoured Presbyterians and Independents.

The Erastian cry to the State for 'Religious Equality' comes exclusively, or all but exclusively, from the sects which are 'Clericalist,' or have an established and official ministry. They ask the Parliament to establish their ministry rather

than their 'Churches.' Though they do not use the word 'establishment,' they ask for the thing. For their complaint is that their ministers are treated by national and parochial society, with the connivance of the State, as the religious inferiors of the episcopal and sacerdotal ministers of the English Church. 'The law which sustains a favoured class, which raises to great social prestige a religious society which I,' writes the Rev. C. A. Berry, 'cannot in conscience join, inflicts on *me* a judgment of inferiority which lays *me* open to every form of ostracism and boycotting.'<sup>1</sup> 'English society to-day,' adds Mr. Berry, 'owing to the mischievous partialism of the State, is honeycombed with irritations and annoyances which keep it in a constant condition of ferment.' Although Dr. Clifford, Dr. Fairbairn, Mr. Horton, and other Dissenting ministers are continually asserting that it is the 'Sacerdotalism' of the Church, rather than the injustice of the State, which is blameable for their under-valuation by English society, Mr. Berry seems to exonerate the Church. 'The State,' says he, 'and the State alone, is responsible for the existence of this grievous wrong.' The State, he implies, can, if it will, set up this glorious idol of 'Religious Equality,' though it is hard to see how it can make all men bow down to it.

There are other Dissenters, however, who maintain that the defect of 'Religious Equality,' or the social under-valuation of the Dissenting minister as such, is neither the fault of the State nor the fault of the Church. It is the fault, say they, of English society itself: the whole English people are to blame for it: it is a democratic sin.

'The extraordinary honours paid to the Archbishop of Cyprus,' said the *Methodist Times* three years ago, 'are a curious social phenomenon. Because he is an Archbishop, though immeasurably inferior in ability, learning, influence, and service to scores of Non-conformist ministers, he is fêted by the Archbishop of Canterbury, sought after by Mr. Gladstone,' etc., etc.'<sup>2</sup>

The casuistry of the Nonconformist conscience may possibly be able to explain how there can be any true 'Religious Equality' between an immeasurably inferior minister, like the Greek Archbishop, and an immeasurably superior minister like the Rev. H. P. Hughes. 'The Wakener of the West,' as the *Pall Mall Gazette* calls this gentleman, has wit enough to see

<sup>1</sup> 'Religious Equality, what remains to be done for its Complete Accomplishment.' *Bicentenary Lectures*, pp. 230, 241, 247.

<sup>2</sup> *The Liberator*, August 1889.



that no Act of Parliament could possibly elevate a benighted Eastern prelate to the high level of an eloquent Wesleyan Methodist preacher. It was not the State, but it was the University of Oxford, which sinned against 'Religious Equality' and against 'scores of immeasurably superior' Dissenting ministers, by making the Archbishop a Doctor of Divinity. The State can hardly be expected, by the most fanatical Liberationist, to compel the University to make 'the Rev. H. P. Hughes, M.A., of Oxford' (as that gentleman used to describe himself), a Doctor of Divinity; nor is Parliament likely to pass an Act forbidding the Archbishop of Canterbury to 'fête' orthodox prelates, and obliging him to 'fête' Dr. Talmage or any other popular American Dissenting preacher who may have cause to visit England.

We have already hinted that while the ministers of the 'clericalist' forms of Dissent insist that the State shall decree that their sects are 'Churches,' and shall give them 'Religious Equality' with the National clergy, yet they themselves do not concede the title of 'Churches' to the non-clericalist and anti-clericalist sects, and they grudge complete 'Religious Equality' with themselves to the ministers of these sects. Thus the writer of a series of articles on 'The Christadelphians' in the *British Weekly* denies that this sect (which has made havoc among the Methodists and Baptists in the Midlands) is one of 'the Churches.' So that when the State, to satisfy the Liberationists, decrees that Wesleyan Methodism and English Presbyterianism are 'Churches,' in the same sense as the Church of England is a 'Church,' and that their preachers are 'ministers,' in the same sense as the National clergy are ministers, it cannot stop here. It must decree that Christadelphianism is not legally 'a Church,' but a sect, and that its preachers are not legally 'ministers.' The Rev. J. G. Rogers seems to exclude the Plymouth Brethren and their ministers from any right to a share in the ideal parliamentary 'Religious Equality' of Liberationism. The 'Brethren' are not a 'Church,' but 'a sect.'<sup>1</sup> The reason which he gives for declaring what he calls 'Plymouthism' to be a sect and not a 'Church' are exact reproductions of the reasons which the Conformists and Non-conformists in the Church of England formerly gave, and which the Presbyterians also formerly gave, for declaring Independent and Anabaptist societies to be sects, and not 'Churches.' In describing the origin and history of 'Plymouthism,' the sect which he hates, he innocently and

<sup>1</sup> *The Church System of England in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 495, 497, 502.

unconsciously describes the origin and history of 'Congregationalism,' the sect which he loves, and which he wants the State to establish in 'Religious Equality' with the 'State Church.' Mr. Rogers says of the Plymouth Brethren exactly what Cartwright, Bernard, Paget, Robert Baillie, and a hundred other adversaries of Brown, Barrowe, and Robinson said of the Independents, and he often uses their very words and expressions.

'The influence exerted, wherever the sect has made itself at all felt,' says Mr. Rogers, 'has been disintegrating, disturbing, and dividing.' 'The Brethren distinctly seek to gather the people of the Lord out of the Churches, where they are at present happy, and where they are probably doing real service.' 'They make it their main business to detach Christians from the Churches where they have a religious home.' 'The fundamental idea of the system when it began to take formal shape was "Christendom in ruins," and on this was based the appeal to the Children of God to come out from it and be separate. Every Church is wrong, because in every one believers and unbelievers are commingled.' 'This sect is aggressive against the Church rather than against the unconverted and unbelieving world.'

The Plymouthists simply reproduce the original attitude of the Independents towards the Catholic Church, the English Church, and every parish church throughout Western Christianity. If the Plymouthists prove themselves to be a 'sect,' and not a Church, by affirming these theories in the nineteenth century against the Independent 'Churches,' Independency proved itself to be a 'sect,' and not a Church, by affirming exactly the same theories against the actual historical Church in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Mr. Rogers cannot accuse what he calls 'Plymouthism' of schism without thereby accusing what he calls the 'Free Churches' of schism. Indeed, some fear of this seems to have dawned upon his mind at the close of his lecture. The founders of Independency certainly taught what Mr. Rogers says the Plymouth Brethren teach—

'that all existing Churches are more or less mixed in their character, and are therefore not to be esteemed as Churches at all.' 'These men, whose special claims to authority are not very discernible, undertake to assert that they have discovered a divine order which has been lost to the Church for centuries, and that those only who will conform to it are of the Body of Christ.'

This is the very principle which Barrowe affirmed throughout his *Discoverie of the False Church*, with the not very important difference that what the Plymouthists now say of

Con  
En  
ing  
from  
is t  
sho  
we  
Con

after  
Chu  
min  
ligio  
of th  
infe  
tinc  
of ne  
of m  
grea  
so fa  
not  
relig  
offic  
in S  
a gr  
yet  
are  
mean  
Diss  
to pr

incun  
bring  
hum  
to gat  
preter  
separ  
they a  
stealin  
of the  
'They  
'We l  
of our  
quinte  
upon  
is muc  
Danie  
the-Fi

Congregationalist Independency he said of the Church of England. We are not surprised that Mr. Rogers should ingenuously remark that 'the Plymouth Brethren have taken from Congregationalism that idea of a *Gathered Church* which is the root of their system.' Nor is it wonderful that he should confess, as if with a sigh of bewilderment, 'In a sense we are all sectaries.' 'They are as much Dissenters as are Congregationalists.'<sup>1</sup>

If the Plymouth Brethren and the other Dissenters are, after all, but different species of one genus—if both are Churches, or both 'sectaries'—it is rather hard that the ministers of one should be advanced by the State to 'Religious Equality' with the National clergy, while the ministers of the other are not to be liberated by the State from religious inferiority to Congregationalist ministers. For the main distinction between the ministers of clericalist and the ministers of non-clericalist Dissenters seems to be this—that the one sort of ministers is eager, and the other sort is not eager, to make a great figure in public. No Plymouthist or Quaker minister, so far as we know, has as yet complained that the State will not allow him to crown the next sovereign, or to preside as religious functionary at the opening of an exhibition, or to officiate as a cemetery chaplain or in a workhouse, or to preach in St. Paul's Cathedral. Each of these has been produced as a grievance by popular Dissenting preachers who sigh for a yet wider popularity. Dissenters, says Mr. Carvell Williams, are 'a proscribed class.' He soon shows, however, that he means by Dissenters the official ministers of some of the Dissenting sects. For he complains that 'they are not allowed to preach in the humblest village church; they are even shut

<sup>1</sup> 'The Sect of Independents,' said T. Hall, the ejected Nonconformist incumbent of King's Norton, 'is prejudicial to the Church of God, as bringing in a confusion.' 'Presbytery is *jure divino*, Episcopacy is *jure humano*; Independency is *jure politico*, a politick device lately found out to gather the choicest flowers out of other men's churches, and under pretence of "Gathering," breaking and scattering Churches.' 'They separate themselves from the true Churches of Christ. They pretend they abhor a mixt company.' 'What more ungodly sacrilege or man-stealing can there be than to purloin from Godly Ministers the first-born of their fervent prayers and faithful preaching, the heaven of their flocks?' 'They will needs gather Churches out of the world, as they phrase it.' 'We have no president in the whole Book of God, as a reverend divine of ours hath well observed, to gather up one Church out of the cream and quintessence of many Churches' (*A Practical and Polemical Commentary upon the Second Epistle of Timothy*, 1658, pp. 166, 167, 176, 177). There is much more to the same effect in *Independency a Great Schism*, by Daniel Cawdrey, the ejected Nonconformist preacher of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields and Belling-Magna, 1657.

out from such poor offices as workhouse and gaol chaplaincies. They are also denied all participation in religious ceremonials of a national character.' However it may be with Presbyterians and Methodists who hold chaplaincies, the marvel is that Congregationalists like Mr. Williams should have become so apostate to the principles upon which their sects were founded, and which their ministry was ordained to affirm, as to wish to be 'chaplains,' or to preach in 'village churches,' or to take part in the 'religious ceremonials' of 'Babylon.' The most honoured of the Independent fathers taught that officiating at marriages and at the burial of the dead were no duties of the true 'ministers of the Gospel.'<sup>1</sup> He taught that the 'village churches' ought to 'be demolished and overthrown' by the State, and to 'be avoided' by all godly persons. He poured scorn upon 'the Homily of Repairing and Keeping clean of Churches.' His teacher, Ainsworth, insisted that all the Old Testament commands for destroying idolatrous places were binding by 'moral equity' in England, where 'the churches were built by Antichrist.'<sup>2</sup>

There is not only a defect of 'Religious Equality,' however, between the proud sects which have 'the One-Man-Ministry' and the humbler sects which own no sort of clergy, or in which all the members are or may be ministers. The absence of the Liberationist ideal is nowhere more startling than it is amongst those very sects which make the loudest clamour about that religious superiority which, as they pretend, is given by the National Commonwealth to the National Clergy. 'Religious Equality' has not yet been established by the Dissenters, even within the sacred negative unity of 'our Common Nonconformity,' where they have no need to call on the Parliament to establish it for them by a law, but can establish it themselves without law. A Unitarian, an heir in the direct line of the English Presbyterians of 1662, lately complained that certain ministers whom he knew were 'excluded from the fraternal meetings so called, the Nonconformist ministers' meetings, on account of their unorthodox views.' Is the Liberationist Act of Parliament, which is to define what a 'Church' is, and what persons are 'ministers,' also to declare that an 'Evangelical' sect is a 'Church,' but that a Unitarian or a Swedenborgian sect is not a 'Church' in the meaning of the Act, any more than the Plymouth Brethren are a 'Church?' When the 'Evangelical' Dissenting sects of 'our Common Nonconformity' petitioned the State not to

<sup>1</sup> J. Robinson, *Works*, ii. 376.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 470, 471.

grant full liberty of conscience and 'Religious Equality' to the Unitarians, it was a Bishop of Lincoln who in the House of Lords asserted the rights of the Unitarian sect against the clamour of 'the Nonconformist conscience,' and who claimed for the Unitarians 'Religious Equality' with the Independents, Baptists, and Methodists.

The Liberationists may say that they cannot ignore the doctrinal line of cleavage which the sects of Calvinism and Methodism have drawn between their 'Free Churches' and the Unitarian and Swedenborgian 'Free Churches.' What then is the community of 'our Common Nonconformity.' Is it, after all, nothing more, as an English priest said two centuries ago, than 'a jargon of different and contrary sects, marshalled in one body, as well as under one name, to fight against the Church of England?'<sup>1</sup>

But is there any actual 'Religious Equality' even amongst the ministers of those 'Free Churches' which are doctrinally agreed? The ministers of the various Methodist sects, eager as they are for the State to confer it by law upon them, seem to withhold it from one another. That there are high-caste and low-caste ministers within the bosom of the Methodist sections of Dissent is evident from a pitiful wail of the Rev. T. Jackson to the *Star*. He complained of 'the slight apparently cast on the Primitive Methodist Connexion at the meetings held by the Nonconformists respecting the great strike. Not one of its many ministers was invited to be a speaker.' The Rev. T. Scrimshaw, a preacher of this section of 'the Free Churches,' asks why the other 'Free Churches' do not concede 'Religious Equality' to the ministers of his 'Free Church.' 'How is it that *our* ministers are so manifestly ignored? Why were *they* ignored by these Nonconformist magnates in the matter of this recent strike?' It appears that there was a bitter trade-competition amongst the sects to get each for itself the biggest possible sectarian dividend out of the exploitation of the strike. Mr. Scrimshaw hopes that 'many others will write pointed letters to the newspapers, attend popular meetings, and ask a few awkward questions.' It seems to us to be an eccentric sort of employment for 'ministers of the Gospel.' But the Primitive Methodist minister says that if they will but do this, 'they will not be long ignored by even the magnates of Nonconformity.'<sup>2</sup> So that it is not by the State or nation, nor by English society, nor by the establishment and endowment

<sup>1</sup> *Cases to Recover Dissenters*, by London Clergy, No. xi. 1684, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *The Primitive Methodist*, October 3, 1889.

of the National clergy, but it is 'by even the magnates of Nonconformity' that one respected class of Dissenting ministers is deprived of its right to 'Religious Equality.' An Act of Parliament can only help these sufferers by pulling down the ministerial 'magnates' of Wesleyan Methodism and the 'Oxford-bred preachers' of Independency, as well as the English bishops and parish priests.

All the sects included within the negative unity of 'our Common Nonconformity' boast that they are not 'sacerdotal.' Within the 'Common Nonconformity,' as in the French Republic, it is 'Clericalism' which is 'the enemy.'

'A Wesleyan local preacher,' says a Dissenting newspaper, 'was requested by a very poor couple to officiate at their marriage, as they were unable to make it an elaborate festive affair. The application came to the ears of the superintendent minister, who refused to sanction the service in the chapel, stating that it would be *lowering the dignity of the ministry* for a local preacher to officiate.'<sup>1</sup>

The writer calls this denial of 'Religious Equality' to a local preacher 'priestly assumption.' The Wesleyan Methodist sects say that all their members are priests; by which they mean none of them are priests: they recognize no difference between a clergyman and layman. Nevertheless, the 'local preachers' of the Wesleyan Methodist 'Church' complain from time to time of the clericalism of the other preachers of the same 'Church,' the descendants of Mr. Wesley's lay preachers, who now call themselves 'ministers.' The sins of the Wesleyan ministers against 'Religious Equality,' according to a Wesleyan writer, 'are responsible for the fact that intelligent young men do not in larger numbers offer themselves for the office of local preacher. 'The sons of our stewards and leading members,' writes Mr. S. Briant, 'have again and again heard the minister expressing the most profound regret at being "compelled to appoint a local." And the natural impression is that a local is an *inferior* person, who has to be endured.' 'To-day, in some quarters,' says another, 'local preachers are spoken of slightly.'<sup>2</sup>

Neither is the bitter cry of some ministers against the violation of 'Religious Equality' by other ministers in the same sect confined to the Methodist branches of Dissent. It is heard also in the Puritan branches of Dissent, where 'a line which the State has' not 'drawn,' but the sect itself has drawn, sunders the high caste of popular and richly-paid minis-

<sup>1</sup> *The Christian Commonwealth*, February 24, 1887.

<sup>2</sup> *The Methodist Times*, February 25, 1892.



ters of 'wealthy churches' and 'the Oxford-bred preachers' from the low caste of poor 'village pastors,' who depend upon some congregational board for part of their stipend. Mr. C. W. Perry, an Independent, questioned by letter every Congregationalist minister in England, and he described the answers which he received as 'an exceeding bitter cry.' One replied, 'The time is not far off when the gulf between the rich churches and pastors and the poor ones will be as deep and dangerous as that between the classes and the masses. Even at present the idea of *brotherhood*'—that is, any genuine 'Religious Equality,' such as there is in the Church between a priest who is a duke's son and a priest who is a shopman's son—'is felt to be very much of a pious farce.' How can Parliament liberate the low-caste Independent 'churches and ministers' from the feeling of 'soreness for want of practical sympathy between the rich pastors and churches and their poorer brethren'? How is the State, even though it should disestablish the National clergy, to establish 'a real growth of brotherhood' between the Independent 'ministers taking 1,200*l.* and 1,000*l.* a year' and 'us poor ministers who are made to feel that we are paupers and beggars dependent upon the goodwill or charity of a few big guns who condescend to help us'? 'We want to be regarded as men, as brothers of those who have their 600*l.* or 1,000*l.* a year,' says a Midland Counties village pastor, 'and not as their poor menials, who have to cringe and bow before them for fear lest we should be denied a 10*l.* grant.' The high-caste ministers of the 'Free Churches' of Congregationalism, it is only fair to say, complain as loudly of the presumption of their low-caste fellows in the ministry in daring to claim 'Religious Equality' with them. 'The door of the Congregational ministry is too wide,' says one, 'and consequently many unfit men enter.' A county secretary groans at 'the incompetence, laziness, and stupidity of the men we are obliged to accept for want of others.' 'The first thing,' writes a leading London minister, 'is to make the door to the ministry narrower.' 'The so-called underpaid ministers,' says another, 'in many cases get more than they would have done as tradesmen, and many left trade because they could do this. Many of them are barely educated, and totally unfit to be ministers.' This writer calls Mr. Perry's appeal to the high-caste ministers of his sect to concede 'Religious Equality' to their low-caste colleagues 'a fanatical appeal.' An honoured veteran protests, 'We have too many small reverends.' A representative of 'Nonconformist Wales' declares that some who are paid 60*l.*

are dear,' and that he fears Mr. Perry's charity would 'keep in the ministry men who should be out of it.'

These are but a few specimens out of a heap of bitter accusations which the rich and poor ministers of Congregationalism are hurling at one another. They are forgotten by Mr. R. T. Horton and Mr. C. S. Horne and the other 'big-salaried ministers' who 'talk with indignation,' as Mr. Perry says, 'of the barrier that prevents our Nonconformist ministers from occupying the pulpits of the Establishment.' This boycotting exists in our Free Church.' The English Commonwealth might fitly call upon the wealthy plutocrats of Liberationism to establish a real 'Religious Equality' at home in their own sects, and for their own fellows, before they agitate at parliamentary elections to get what they call 'Religious Equality' established by the secular arm for themselves.

'Religious Equality' in the Liberationist sense—or the compulsion of English society by the State to recognize the clergy of the nation and the preachers of some of the sects as 'ministers' of exactly the same kind and degree—would be as unattainable after the disestablishment of the clergy as it now is. Even Mr. Berry has some misgiving as to whether it is in the power of the State to give him and his colleagues the whole gift which they demand.

'Not at once, indeed,' says he, 'will the adventitious prestige of State patronage cease to give an unreal influence to the Church which has so long possessed it. A favoured Church inevitably becomes a fashionable Church, and a Church both favoured and fashionable has alike the power and the will to exercise social tyranny.'<sup>1</sup>

The Liberationist ideal of 'Religious Equality,' so far as the State can establish it, is established in the United States of America. Yet even in that glorious land of 'Free Churches' there is no more equality amongst all that are called 'ministers' than there is in England. American newspapers are crowded with instances. The Rev. J. M. Townsend, 'a coloured minister,' who has a high social standing and is a heavy taxpayer, applied at a Fourth Ward School in Indiana for admission for his daughter to study German. The girl 'had a pure Caucasian complexion,' but the principal, learning that the young lady was 'coloured,' sent her home with a letter to her father, explaining that 'the School Board allowed

<sup>1</sup> *The Independent*, October 9, 1891.

<sup>2</sup> 'Religious Equality.' *Bicentenary Lectures*, p. 241.

nor  
com

'T  
comp  
Stree  
enter  
same  
woul

The  
tion  
the  
Equa  
Fath  
Inde

T

we co  
dema

preac

new

Oxfo

which

the e

logica

Wesle

colleg

is him

paper

met w

really

Hugh

been p

Th

chapel

Horne

1 'T

says D

Breslau

he adds

but inst

Ausschl

(Die K

Erschein

shows th

or 'Bap

p. 221).

2 77

none but "white" children to study German.' The father complained of this violation of 'Religious Equality.'

'The School Board explained that a comfortable building and competent teachers were provided for coloured pupils in South Marion Street and another in Goosetown. If his child were permitted to enter the white schools, there would be a dozen applications of the same kind in less than a week, and white and coloured children would be under the necessity of *mixing*.'

The schools in the American States—the ideal of our Liberationists—would be in as terrible a condition as the parishes of the Church of England, whose witness to the 'Religious Equality' of the 'mixed multitude' as children of the same Father was the provoking cause of the foundation of the first Independent and Anabaptist 'Free Churches.'

This story from the land of 'Religious Equality,' to which we could add a thousand others, should be compared with the demand now made by some of the sects for 'Oxford-bred' preachers. The contention put forth by the friends of the new movement,' says a Dissenting newspaper, 'is that these Oxfordian divines will check that exodus of rich young men which has always been a grief.'<sup>2</sup> As the Unitarians followed the example of the Independents, and transferred their theological college to Oxford, so Mr. Hughes once proposed in the Wesleyan Conference that his sect should erect a Wesleyan college in the same town. 'Mr. Hugh Price Hughes, M.A., is himself an Oxford man, we believe,' says the same newspaper, 'and attributes the kind and degree of success he has met with in life to his Oxford training.' But all that he can really have meant by describing himself as 'the Rev. H. P. Hughes, M.A., of Oxford,' was to record the fact that he had been preacher in the Wesleyan chapel in the city of Oxford.

The Rev. R. F. Horton, the minister of an Independent chapel in the wealthy suburb of Hampstead, and the Rev. S. Horne, the minister of an Independent chapel in the wealthy

<sup>1</sup> 'The New World has indeed become the fruitful Mother of Sects,' says Dr. Hermann Schmidt, Professor of (Evangelical) Theology at Breslau. They have no real religious equality, which must be built up, he adds, on 'eine tiefergehende Verbündung von Kirche und Volksthum,' but instead of it 'ein eigenthümliches Nebeneinander von fanatischer Ausschlusslichkeit und beinahe charakterlose gegenseitiger Duldung' (*Die Kirche: ihre biblische Idee und die Formen ihrer geschichtlichen Erscheinung in ihrem Unterschiede von Sekte*, 1888, pp. 217, 218). He shows that no change in size and number can ever alter 'Methodismus' or 'Baptismus' from what they must always remain by nature (*Sekten*, p. 221).

<sup>2</sup> *The Christian Million*, October 24, 1889.

and fashionable suburb of Kensington—two of these ‘Oxford-bred preachers’—write and talk a great deal about ‘Religious Equality.’ To many a poor parish priest who cannot afford to send his sons to a university created by the Church, and principally for the education of priests of the Church, it must seem that the real ‘Meaning of Religious Equality’—the title of one of Mr. Horton’s letters to the *Spectator*—is the opening of the University to rich Dissenters, the representatives of the *Grosskapitalismus*, and the closing of it against poor Churchmen. The *Independent* publishes every week the portrait and biography of some candidate for the next Parliament who belongs to its own sect. There are hardly any in this catalogue, so suggestive of the list of names from which the scandalous ‘Barebones Parliament’ was composed, who do not belong to the rich and mighty of the world, who are denounced by ‘the Labour Party’ and by the advocates of Socialist Equality as the most unfit men who could possibly be sent into the House of Commons. All these foes of ‘Social Equality’ are fierce champions of ‘Religious Equality;’ and a considerable number of these patrons of ‘the Free Churches’ have acquired through their great wealth and the favour of the State that University culture which is now not so easily obtained, as once it was, by the poor sons of ‘the State-favoured Church.’ Having got so much, at the cost of the Church, they now demand by their chaplains to have all, which is a modern repetition of the demand of the great Puritan landlords and Church-spoilers under the Tudors and under the Long Parliament. Only the watchword differs. The disestablishment of Church and People, which the robbers of the monastic, episcopal, and cathedral lands demanded by their ‘trencher-chaplains,’ as Archbishop Laud called them, under the partisan war-cry of ‘Further Reformation,’ their present-day successors demand under the partisan war-cry of ‘Religious Equality.’ In this Liberationist ‘Equality’ there is small share for any except those whom the Blessed Virgin calls in the ‘Magnificat’ the proud, the mighty, and the rich; the humble and meek, the poor and the hungry, are by the great commercial and ministerial magnates of Liberationism sent empty away. The candidate of the ‘Labour Party,’ as Mr. Cunningham Graham tells us, is as hateful to them in the State as the representative of the Catholic or universal human theology is in the Church. ‘Why should the National Universities,’ demands Mr. Horton, say that their theological professors must all be Episcopalians? Or why should they refuse their Divinity degrees (which a more eminent Congregationalist than Mr. Horton declared to

be:  
to  
Ch  
nat  
oug  
ligi  
‘th  
tivi  
Con  
Sta  
but  
Mr.  
tion  
the  
Chu  
vers  
defin  
nam  
tical  
(if o  
into  
selve  
I  
Equ  
secu  
sole  
equa  
part  
every  
Disse  
coun  
the c  
super  
Pasto  
pries  
seen)  
of Di  
It  
town  
muni  
coun  
gener  
to th  
1  
ber 10

be sins against 'the Religious Equality established by Christ') to men who do not wish to take orders in the Episcopal Church?'<sup>1</sup> If the Universities belong to the State or nation, which, according to Mr. Horton's Liberationist party, ought to have no theology at all, it is a gross sin against 'Religious Equality' for the 'National Universities' to have any 'theological' professors at all. Is not an Agnostic or a Positivist as true and full a member of the Commonwealth as a Congregationalist or a Wesleyan is? What just right has the State to extend its patronage to Dr. Fairbairn and Mr. Horton but refuse it to Mr. Voysey or Mr. Foote? What title has Mr. Horton to impose upon the National State and the 'National Universities' his own sectarian word 'Episcopalian' as the legal definition of a member or a minister of the National Church? How angry he would be if the State and the Universities were so historically precise and conscientious as to define him and Dr. Fairbairn as 'Brownists'! Yet this is the name by which every truly learned professor of ecclesiastical history must first know the Independents, and by which (if our 'State Dissenters' could spare time to make researches into their own *origines*) they should be proud to call themselves.

But Mr. Horton pretends that under the flag of 'Religious Equality' he and his colleagues are fighting for all sorts of secular equality. 'What we mean by *equality* is simply and solely equality in the eyes of the governing power, and equality in the treatment which the State in its various departments affords to its citizens.' As a matter of fact and every-day observation, nothing is more clear than that the Dissenting minister in the towns (however it may be in the country) is so far from suffering from religious inequality with the clergy that he often enjoys a great degree of religious superiority over the clergy. If the 'Dissenting Village Pastors' complain of their want of equality with the parish priests of the villages, they complain still more (as we have seen) of their want of equality with the 'big-salaried ministers' of Dissent in the towns and suburban villadom.

It is usually the habit of Dissenting ministers in the towns to push themselves to the front in all political and municipal concerns. In the House of Commons, in the town councils, and most representative bodies, religious minorities generally enjoy a share of office which is out of all proportion to their numbers. A sect, from the nature of the case, is more

<sup>1</sup> 'The Meaning of Religious Equality' (*Christian World*, December 10, 1885).

pushing than a whole people is likely to be. The belief amongst the democracy of Birmingham that a small oligarchy of Presbyterians (as the Unitarians were called in the last century) had managed to secure to themselves and their friends almost all public offices and power in the town brought about the terrible 'Church and King' riots, so vividly described by William Hutton.

'According to Dr. Priestley's statement, a violent animosity had subsisted for years between the High Church Party (described as "the Mob") and the Dissenters of the place; the cause of which the doctor candidly attributes to the circumstance of the Dissenters being possessed of all the principal power, and constantly nominating to the civil offices.'<sup>1</sup>

The Birmingham fight between the Church-and-King mob and the Dissenters had not a few points of likeness to the contemporary struggle on the Continent between 'the blind rage of democracy on the one hand, and the insatiable ambition of tyrants on the other.'<sup>2</sup> The 'Church-and-King Mob' was the 'democracy,' and the clique of Nonconformist absorbers of public offices 'the tyrants,' in the English town.

Certain it is that there are many Dissenting ministers, as there are many laymen, who are regarded by the most 'sacerdotal' clergy who know them, not simply as their equals, but as their superiors in eloquence, scholarship, and devotion to all manner of good works. Neither do the clergy feel any envy or jealousy when they see the State, or a municipality, prefer to some vacant post a capable Dissenter or Dissenting minister to a less capable layman or clergyman of the Church of England. The Liberationist agitators forget, or conveniently ignore, that it was after all a Parliament of Churchmen, as Samuel Bownas the Quaker said in 1712, which secured 'Religious Equality' to Dissenters.

'The late Act of Indulgence,' said William Ray, the parish priest, to Bownas, 'was agreed upon by the Bishops, Lords, and Commons of our Communion, an instance of such moderation as was never shewn to our Church (nor to the Quakers) by any other sect who had us under their power, whether Papists, or some violent and fierce Protestant Dissenters, who perhaps would handle us as roughly as our predecessors were handled by them, if God should permit us to fall under their merciless hands.'

The Quaker preacher wrote in reply, 'I acknowledge thee to be a member of that Church and Society who have granted

<sup>1</sup> *Annual Register*, 1791, p. 211.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 213.

us th  
an in  
at th  
unde  
was  
Qual  
judic  
Engl  
of Pa  
Qual  
auth  
Lord

T  
are c  
and  
migh  
'Reli  
The  
with  
and  
of th  
so m  
publi  
altho  
its m  
of 'R  
Only  
grum  
sentin  
fath  
great  
as yo

N  
the  
espec

<sup>1</sup> 7  
pp. 17

<sup>2</sup> J  
Samu  
Owen  
dayes  
the O  
his do  
Crom  
perse  
ad Ac  
Tho. L



us the indulgence we now enjoy in the exercise of our religion,'<sup>1</sup> an indulgence which had been refused to all Quaker ministers, at the instigation of the Presbyterian and Independent ministers, under the Rump Commonwealth and under Cromwell. It was the intervention of King Charles II. which rescued the Quaker preachers, not merely from imprisonment, but from judicial murder by the fierce Independent ministers of New England. The first Christian minister and the first member of Parliament who spoke publicly on behalf of the dreaded Quakers was Dr. Gauden, Bishop of Exeter (the reputed author of the *Eikon Basilike*), who declared in the House of Lords that they were 'the innocentest of all the sects.'<sup>2</sup>

The unbeneficed priests in a populous town, although they are called 'State-favoured ministers' by the Liberationists, and are indeed the clergy of the nation and the parishes, might with some reason complain that they are denied 'Religious Equality' with the local Dissenting ministers. The pastors of the 'Free Churches' have a closer interest with Mammon than a curate has; the great local capitalists and manufacturers are frequently the patrons and members of their chapels. Hence the Dissenting ministers are put on so many public committees, and asked to speak at so many public meetings; whereas the curates of the National Church, although they are at least 'ministers,' are mostly regarded by its municipality, the local organ of the State, as undeserving of 'Religious Equality' with the wealthy pastors of the sects. Only a man utterly wanting in the true priestly spirit would grumble at the favour shown by his town council to Dissenting ministers. He would not say of the little local fatherland what the Rev. C. W. Berry angrily says of the great national fatherland—'The land, which is ours as well as yours, has lifted you into favour and patronage.'

No Liberationist can deny that such a preferment of the Dissenting minister above the 'State-favoured priest,' especially where the minister happens to be unbeneficed, is a

<sup>1</sup> *The Life, Travels, and Christian Experience of Samuel Bownas*, pp. 172-178.

<sup>2</sup> *Episcopos Aposkopos: the Bishop Busied beside the Business*, by Samuel Fisher, 1662, pp. 4, 8, 14, 18, 35, 59. 'That divine Doctor Owen,' said Fisher two years earlier of the famous Independent, 'in the days of his Vicechancellorship, what influence was given by him to the Oxford persecutions, he knows, as well as others, and what influence his doctrine might have upon the Powers [the Rump Parliament and Cromwell] to whom he often preached, to the stirring them up to more persecution than they were free for, all may see that can read.' *Rusticus ad Academicos: the Rustick's Alarm to the Rabbies, viz. John Owen, D.D., Tho. Danson, M.A., John Tombs, B.D., and Rich. Baxter*, 1660, p. 126.

constant and every-day phenomenon of the public life of England. If the Pope's 'Archbishop of Westminster,' Dr. Clifford, Mr. Hugh Price Hughes, and three curates of London parishes were present together at some Mansion House meeting, what would be the conduct of the Lord Mayor towards the three 'State-favoured ministers' and the three 'Free Church ministers' respectively? According to the Liberationist hypothesis, he would call upon the three Anglican curates to speak, he would put the three Anglican curates upon his committee, because they are the favoured minions of the State and of society; but he would condemn the Roman, Baptist, and Wesleyan ministers to silence, and refuse them the dignity of committee-men. This is what Liberationist clamour implies. And a foreigner who had no knowledge of England, except such as he derived from the Dissenting press or platform would suppose this to be the daily practice among us. Yet we know that it is the very opposite which is true; the Lord Mayor, or any mayor, or any public or municipal functionary would invite the three eminent Dissenters to speak, would put them upon his committee, and would leave the three obscure curates (in spite of their national and parochial character) in the outer darkness of religious inferiority.

A National priest, in his character as a beneficed parson, may seem to be favoured by the State. But the whole order which is railed upon by the Liberationist as a State-favoured clergy is not beneficed, nor is it possible that it ever should be beneficed. A National priest as such—that is, as one of Christ's ministers to the nation—has no kind of favour from the Commonwealth. Although he may have spent a long life in hard service to the nation, and may have been stigmatized throughout his life by rich Dissenting ministers and Parliament-men as 'a paid official of the ecclesiastical branch of the Civil Service,' the English Commonwealth does not grant him a pension for his old age, such as the 'established' clergy enjoy in every other European State. The English clergy, as such, are not an 'endowed' clergy in the sense in which the Liberationists pretend—that is, as the nation's public servants in the army, navy, law, police, and various branches of the Civil Service are endowed. The very most that can be said of the so-called 'Act-of-Parliament Clergy' is that they are capable of endowment, which is a widely different thing.

The Dissenting minister as such, on the contrary, has long been and still is the spoilt boy of the State, the petted child of the municipalities, and the object of the rival courtiership

of our  
to think  
Archbi  
Archbi  
few, wh  
powerfu  
scale at  
priest,  
captain  
more v  
describ  
is neve  
by the  
(the h  
give!),  
ministe  
itself a  
is, abou  
to be a  
not the  
superior

It c  
superior  
priests,  
ministe  
sect or  
a prote  
land in  
each of  
or dead  
founder  
refused  
'Prelat  
the Nor  
they li  
instead  
ratists.  
of his  
conform  
said Ro  
'have  
had be  
Robins

of our political partisans. This fact is not due, as he seems to think, to his own enormous religious superiority over Greek Archbishops or over English curates, but to the fact that Greek Archbishops command no votes, and English curates none or few, whereas the Dissenting minister is the chaplain to a powerful minority, which possesses votes enough to turn the scale at a parliamentary election. Hence it is that one Roman priest, one Primitive Methodist preacher, one Salvationist captain is regarded by office-seekers in the State to be of more value than a hundred of those ministers who are loftily described by an Independent D.D. as 'mere curates.' There is never a session in which the Parliament is not agitated by the selfish clamour of 'the Nonconformist Conscience' (the horse-leech of our politics, crying ceaselessly, 'Give, give!'), with tender concern for the interests of the Dissenting minister; but not once in fifty years does Parliament give itself a moment's anxiety about the unbeneficed clergy, that is, about the priests of the nation simply as such. It seems to be a parliamentary axiom that the Dissenting minister is not the 'religious equal,' but that he is very much the religious superior, of the English curate.

It ought not to be forgotten that the tremendous religious superiority of the Separatist preachers to the English parish priests, and not the 'Religious Equality' of these two sorts of ministers, was the original doctrine of Dissent. As each new sect or 'Free Church' generated out of the Puritan germ was a protest against the 'Religious Equality' of the whole fatherland in the sight of the Father of all, so the new ministers of each of these sects denied the claim of all bishops, priests, or deacons to 'Religious Equality' with themselves. The founders and first preachers of Independency and Anabaptism refused the title of 'ministers of Christ,' not only to the 'Prelatical' clergy like Whitgift and Hooker, but even to the Nonconformist clergy like Reynolds and Bernard, because they lived within the English Church as Nonconformists instead of coming out of the National Babylon as Separatists. Barrowe and Greenwood, and Penry in the latest of his treatises, wrote much more fiercely against the Nonconformists than they did against the Conformists. 'You,' said Robinson to the deprived and silenced Nonconformists, 'have the same office as the mass-priests,'<sup>1</sup> because they had been ordained by bishops. Episcopal ordination, said Robinson to Bishop Hall, prevents its receiver from being a

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, ii. 372; cf. 376, 378.

'minister,' and it 'is to be renounced as part of that *pseudo-clergy* and antichristian hierarchy derived from Rome.'<sup>1</sup> He had himself been ordained by a bishop, but in order to become a real or Congregationalist 'minister,' as he boasts, 'I cast away my popish priesthood.'<sup>2</sup> His Baptist opponents, citing this confession against him, demanded why he stopped at the rejection of his holy orders, and did not also reject his holy baptism. They denied that he could be a real 'minister' so long as he 'retained his popish washing for his Christianity.'<sup>3</sup> Dr. Fairbairn's ministry, Mr. Horton's ministry, and Mr. Berry's ministry, as Independents, had its origin in the theory, and stand to-day upon the assumption, that all English priests, and all the Presbyterian ministers too, are nothing more than 'pseudo-clergy,' that is, are no 'ministers' at all. Is it not, then, a very great impertinence and impiety for the Bishop of Oxford to claim 'Religious Equality' with Dr. Fairbairn; or for the Vicar and Curate of Hampstead to pretend they can be made by Act of Parliament religiously equal to Mr. Horton; or for the Queen's official Presbyterian chaplains in Scotland, though they are all Nonconformists, to ignore Mr. Berry's religious superiority over themselves? And as the ministry of these three eminent Independents rose out of the hypothesis that no Catholic bishop, priest, or deacon, and no Presbyterian pastor, can possibly be a true 'minister,' so Dr. Clifford's present ministry as a Baptist had its birth and beginning out of the denial that Robert Brown, or John Penry, or John Robinson, or any Independent who baptized infants could possibly be a 'minister of Christ.' A great advance was made in charity and insight when a Baptist conceded that an Independent could be a Christian minister, and when the Independents made the like concession to a Presbyterian minister, and even to a Nonconformist rector or vicar; but greater still is made when the Separatist ministers concede it to all the conforming clergy, as now they willingly do. But, as the keen mind of Defoe perceived, it is ecclesiastical suicide on their part, and they are driven to seek new apologies for their separation, and to justify their sects by arguments which would have horrified the founders of them.

The religious world in the last century, and far into our own, ceased to be Puritan; part of it took a Methodist and part of it a Calvinist Evangelical colour. The object of its ministers ceased to be the creation of the perfect visible

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, iii. 409.<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* iii. 452.<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 3.

Church  
Puritan  
a better  
continuo  
zealous  
one thi  
Method  
be built  
or to Ro  
truly co  
choose v

It wa  
some of  
Equality  
ministers  
that som  
preached  
'the Gos  
of Indep  
that the  
Puritan s  
the tacit  
called 'th  
ing to Top  
or even i  
Presbyter  
heard in  
house.

'Your  
preached  
is preache  
compelled,  
to hear it  
remains th

Hence th  
tarians), v  
day to be  
religious s

<sup>1</sup> *Works*<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* v<sup>3</sup> The ge

the Noncon  
you takes hi  
and priests-  
such a man

Church, all whose members should be 'visible Saints,' as the Puritan phrase was: they gave up the *social* attempt to create a better Church than that which Christ had founded and continued for all nations and every creature; they were nobly zealous only for the conversion of the *individual* soul, as the one thing needful. The 'true Church,' according to the Methodist and Calvinist Evangelical conception, was not to be built upon a pattern revealed in Holy Scriptures to Calvin or to Robert Brown: it was simply the agglomeration of all truly converted souls, who, after conversion, were free to choose what Church or sect best suited them.

It was a prevailing opinion in the religious world while some of us were young that there could be no 'Religious Equality' amongst all those who were professionally called ministers of Christ. It was taken for granted by this world that *some* clergymen of the English Church—the few who preached what Methodism or Calvinist Evangelicalism called 'the Gospel'—were consequently almost the religious equals of Independent, Baptist, and Methodist preachers. It is true that they disagreed as fiercely over 'the Gospel' as the Puritan sects disagreed over 'the visible Church.' Yet it was the tacit assumption of the sectarian *Zeitgeist* that what it called 'the Gospel'—whether according to Wesley or according to Toplady—might be accidentally heard in a parish church, or even in a cathedral; that it was sure not to be heard in a Presbyterian (Unitarian) chapel, but that it was sure to be heard in a Baptist meeting-house or a Methodist preaching-house.

'Your friend lives in a part of England where the Gospel is not preached by the clergy of the Established Church. But the Gospel is preached in a neighbouring congregation of Dissenters. He is compelled, therefore, either not to hear the Gospel preached at all, or to hear it preached at a Dissenting meeting-house.'<sup>1</sup> 'The Liturgy remains the same. Blessed be God, the clergy are forced to read it.'<sup>2</sup>

Hence the Dissenting ministers, as such (except the Unitarians), were not imagined by the religious world of the day to be the 'religious equals,' but to be the unquestionable religious superiors, of the English bishops and parish priests.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Works of Augustus Toplady*, vi. 149, 196, 243.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* vi. 293; cf. 294.

<sup>3</sup> The gentle Bishop Patrick had observed in 1669 the like claim of the Nonconformist ministers to religious superiority. 'The meanest of you takes himself to be wiser than the best of us, than any of our bishops and priests—nay, the whole clergy put together. And if we will not have such a man in the same esteem that he hath himself, presently we are

Is 'Religious Equality,' according to the Liberationist notion of it, established anywhere, so that we can see what it is? Yes, says Mr. Carvell Williams, you can see it in Ireland. 'Ireland is the only part of the kingdom where "Religious Equality" has yet been attained.'<sup>1</sup> This pretentious phrase then, when it is examined, turns out to be nothing more than a synonym for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish bishops and priests. 'Religious Equality' amounts to the establishment of the equality of the Pope's archbishops and bishops with the Irish archbishops, and to the establishment of the immense superiority of the Pope's ministers in Ireland over the Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Wesleyan, Unitarian, Plymouthist, and all other ministers in Ireland. For Mr. Carvell Williams will not deny that the State now grants in Ireland, and always will grant, to a Cardinal Archbishop of Dublin as 'irritating and insulting' a precedence over an Irish Baptist or Wesleyan minister as it grants in England to a Bishop of Oxford over a principal of a Dissenting college in Oxford. Indeed, poor Mr. Guinness Rogers has plaintively confessed that when the glorious gift of 'Religious Equality' has at last been wrung from the State it will turn out to be nothing but irreligious inequality! 'The Cardinal's position,' says he, 'is different from that of a Nonconformist' (meaning a Dissenting) 'minister.' Cardinal Manning was as really a Separatist as Mr. Rogers is, but a Separatist with episcopal and priestly character, and therefore as gross a 'sacerdotalist,' in Mr. Horton's sense, as the Bishop of Liverpool or the Bishop of Lincoln. He was 'a prince of the Church. While human nature is human nature,' sighs the Rev. J. G. Rogers, 'a prince of the Church receives a deference, even from Liberal and Protestant journals, which a Dissenting minister must not expect.'<sup>2</sup>

So it appears, as the conclusion of all, that it is not the English State or Commonwealth, neither is it the establishment and endowment of the English Church, nor is it the character of English society; but it is 'human nature' which is to blame for the persistent depreciation of the ministers of the English sects. If our Parliament pretended to such an international and universal jurisdiction as that which the Pope claims, or if the electors could return a

look upon as enemies of the power of godliness, formal fellows, or meer moralists' (*Continuation of the Friendly Debate*, 4th edit pp. 72, 73).

<sup>1</sup> *Bicentenary Lectures*. 'Progress from Toleration to Religious Equality,' p. 165.

<sup>2</sup> *The Congregational Review*, January 1890, p. 95.

major  
disen  
of this  
Disse  
what

AR

1. San  
Je  
C  
10
2. S.  
C  
st
3. Cyp  
B
4. Cyp  
18
5. The  
an  
S  
S

If the  
of Nic  
collecti  
Jerome  
sponde  
unique.  
tius is c  
on the  
the leas  
one ha  
in the  
the rel  
Corneli  
are too  
with th  
Hartel's  
of Deci  
Rome a



majority of lunatics, it might pass an Act to disestablish and disendow 'human nature.' But until it can do something of this sort, it is impossible for it to satisfy the bitter cry of Dissenting Clericalism, and secure to every sectarian minister what he calls 'Religious Equality.'

---

ART. VI.—ST. CYPRIAN'S CORRESPONDENCE.

1. *Sancti Cæcili Cypriani Opera recognita et illustrata per Joannem* [FELL] *Oxoniensem Episcopum: accedunt Annales Cyprianici per Joannem* [PEARSON] *Cestriensem.* (Oxford, 1682.)
2. *S. Thasci Cypriani Opera Omnia recensuit et Commentario Critico instruxit* GULIELMUS HARTEL. Pars II.—*Epistolæ.* (Vienna, 1871.)
3. *Cyprianus, Thascius Cæcilius* [in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography.* By Archbishop BENSON]. (London, 1877.)
4. *Cyprian von Karthago.* Von OTTO RITSCHL. (Göttingen, 1885.)
5. *The Cheltenham List of the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, and of the Writings of Cyprian* [in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, vol. iii.]. By Professor SANDAY. (Oxford, 1891.)

IF the history of the century which succeeded the Council of Nicæa is illustrated by a not inconsiderable number of collections of letters—notably by those of St. Basil, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine—for ante-Nicene times the correspondence of St. Cyprian occupies a position which is quite unique. It is true that a series of seven letters of St. Ignatius is extant, which are invaluable for the light they throw on the doctrine and organization of the Church in perhaps the least known generation of its history. But these, on the one hand, are rather treatises or exhortations than letters in the ordinary sense of the term; while, on the other, the relics preserved by Eusebius of the correspondence of Cornelius of Rome, and even of Dionysius of Alexandria, are too slight and fragmentary to stand in any comparison with the eighty-one epistles which form the second volume of Hartel's edition of St. Cyprian's works. For the persecution of Decius, for the Novatianist troubles arising out of it at Rome and Karthage, for the controversy on Rebaptism be-

tween the bishops of these two sees, for at least the earlier stages of the persecution of Valerian, we possess here contemporary evidence, and evidence of that uniquely valuable character belonging only to letters, which photograph for us, so to speak, each separate stage of the history, and enable us to trace, as in no other way could be done, the formation of opinions and the development of events.

In the case of St. Cyprian, the preservation of so large a portion of his official correspondence is to be attributed primarily to the business-like habits which especially distinguished the writer, who is *par excellence* also the statesman of the ante-Nicene Church. If in justifying his course of action to one African bishop, Antonianus, at the close of the Decian persecution, he has occasion to appeal to words of his own written while it was still raging, a copy of them is at his side.<sup>1</sup> Whatever letters, during his absence from Karthage, he sends to his clergy there, he is anxious that bishops or clergy of other cities who may happen to be visiting the capital should have an opportunity of hearing what he says, and, if they wish, of transcribing it for their own use. Where a group of letters of one period shape out a policy which his colleagues would do well to adopt in their own dioceses, it is circulated in book form throughout the African Episcopate. Nor, of course, was Cyprian insensible to the advantages of united action, not merely in the African provinces, but in the whole of the Latin-speaking Churches as well; a series of letters to the Roman Church enclose, one after another, packets of those which he had just been addressing to correspondents in Africa. Conversely, if a declaration from Rome supports the line which he has independently initiated in Africa, care is at once taken that copies of it should be despatched 'throughout the whole world' in order that dissentients from the policy authorized at Karthage may realize that they are setting themselves in opposition, not to their own Primate only, but also to the great churches across the sea. When, however, the Pope of Rome entered into controversy with the Primate of Africa, it seems probable that similar provision was not necessarily made for the circulation of Roman letters, for it is only at the special request of Bishop Pompeius that a copy of Stephen's answer to the African pronouncements on Rebaptism is transmitted to him.<sup>2</sup>

It might thus have been natural to conjecture that, as

<sup>1</sup> Ep. lv. 4, quoting Ep. xix. 2

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ep. xxxii. ; Epp. xxv. xxvi. ; Epp. xx. 2, xxvii. 3, xxxv. xlv. 4 ; Ep. xxx. 5 ; Ep. lxxiv. 1.

Karth  
the ar  
fariou  
collect  
after  
there  
his Ci  
corres  
or fro  
imme  
the fir  
was g  
them  
among  
in ar  
anoth  
tainly  
of the  
super  
(in hi  
to Ste  
know  
the qu  
to Ste  
(Ep. l  
trover  
but ne

Th  
only s  
compl  
we ha  
on iso  
have p  
St. Cy  
letters  
of one  
the w  
media  
there  
extan  
requir  
to ma

<sup>1</sup> T  
to supp  
<sup>2</sup> C

Karthage had been the centre of St. Cyprian's activity, and the archives of its see must have contained copies of his multifarious correspondence, an official and authorized edition of his collected works would, if not in his lifetime, at any rate soon after his death, have been put into circulation there. But there was, it would appear, no Atticus to fulfil this office for his Cicero. The phenomena of the posthumous history of the correspondence, as gathered either from the extant manuscripts or from notices in the great writers of the generations which immediately succeeded, all point to unofficial action, and in the first place to small collections as the nucleus round which was gradually worked up the mass of letters as we know them now.<sup>1</sup> On the one hand, the leading representatives among the numerous manuscripts exhibit the correspondence in arrangements totally independent in the main of one another; on the other, even St. Augustine, who would certainly have possessed a completed edition, if such had existed, of the works of his great African predecessor, finds an insuperable puzzle in a reference by Bishop Crescens of Cirta (in his vote at the Rebaptism Council) to a letter of Cyprian to Stephen about Rebaptism. 'Why,' says St. Augustine, 'I know that letter very well, but it does not say a word about the question.' Now, as a matter of fact, we possess two letters to Stephen, and while the one (Ep. lxviii.) does not, the other (Ep. lxxii.) does contain a discussion of the Rebaptism controversy. It is clear that St. Augustine possessed the one, but never so much as guessed of the existence of another.<sup>2</sup>

The want of any such authoritative edition in early times only serves, however, to throw into greater relief the striking completeness of the collection as we have it now. Of course we have no means of checking the number of letters written on isolated topics in individual cases, and many of these may have perished. But as regards the controversies with which St. Cyprian's name is more especially connected, the mass of letters are so intimately bound up together that the absence of one link in the chain could not pass unnoticed; yet in the whole group belonging to the period during and immediately after the Decian persecution—Epp. v. to lx.—while there are plenty of gaps in the series addressed to him, the extant productions of his pen, forty-four in number, would require only to be supplemented here and there in order to make an absolutely perfect set.<sup>3</sup> So gradually, however,

<sup>1</sup> The case is different with the treatises, which there is some reason to suppose may have been collected in a quasi-official edition.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Studia Biblica*, iii. 324.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Epp. xxxvi. 4, lix. 9.

did this collection complete itself, that out of the fifty-six letters forming the group just mentioned, fifteen are entirely unrepresented in any one of the ten manuscripts earlier than the tenth century used by Hartel.<sup>1</sup> We are again thrown back upon the hypothesis of individual effort resulting in the formation of small collections of the principal, or some of the principal, letters dealing with various single questions. Thus, while nine letters in the editions are addressed to Cornelius of Rome, a group of eight was already known in the fourth century, as Jerome's Chronicle and the Cheltenham List, of which we are about to speak, testify; nor does any one of the families of Cyprianic manuscripts contain less than five or six, and these arranged in more or less the same order. Even more distinct in the earliest manuscripts and the Cheltenham List (partly also in Lucifer of Cagliari) is a group written to or about the confessors and martyrs; and a third is formed before the Cheltenham List and St. Augustine of the chief pronouncements about Rebaptism.<sup>2</sup>

To what extent this process had reached in the fourth and beginning of the fifth century, we are to some degree enabled to judge by the extant literature of that time. In some parts of the East, indeed, so small was the demand for Latin authors, or so small the knowledge of Latin among Greeks, that even Eusebius seems only to have known Cyprian through the medium of the (Greek) correspondence of Cornelius of Rome and of Dionysius of Alexandria; yet collections of his epistles, perhaps in Latin, found in Rufinus's day a ready sale in Constantinople; and some of his writings were certainly translated into Greek, and even into Syriac. But to the West St. Cyprian was not merely, or not primarily, a great writer, but a great man. Apart entirely from the literary or theological value of his works, he had stamped his personality too deeply on the face of the history of his generation to be easily forgotten. He had, indeed, contributed, by his treatises on Patience, on Envy, on Almsgiving, valuable material towards the systematic treatment of Christian ethics:<sup>3</sup> but Tertullian had done the same before him with deeper

<sup>1</sup> But several of them, and especially those written by Cyprian himself, were contained in the lost Verona manuscript, probably of the seventh century.

<sup>2</sup> The first group, Epp. 44, 45, 47, 48, 51, 52, 57, 59, 60, of which Ep. 48 is probably the one added to St. Jerome's eight; the second, Epp. 6, 10, 28, 37, 11, 38, 39; the third, Epp. 73, 71, 70, 74, and *Sententia Episcoporum*. See Dr. Sanday in *Studia Biblica*, iii. 295 ff., and especially the tables pp. 284-7.

<sup>3</sup> See Archbishop Benson in *Dict. Christian Biog.*

though  
rich n  
—am  
tively  
of Te  
dencie  
of sus  
macy  
to his  
St. A  
the in  
for his  
first h  
a ma  
as sch  
of Al  
second  
Laure  
equall  
ginati  
St. Cy  
W  
might  
tine  
witnes  
List.  
Phillip  
valua  
in a n  
and N  
the in  
lation  
and I  
and V  
the li  
dates  
rough  
books  
one is  
fourth  
centur  
Africa  
1 C  
trum.  
2 S

thought, more fiery rhetoric, more pointed epigram ; and the rich mine of Tertullianic literature was, with some exceptions—among whom must be noted Cyprian himself<sup>1</sup>—comparatively unworked. Exception may have been taken to many of Tertullian's writings on the ground of their Montanist tendencies. But St. Cyprian might equally have been an object of suspicion at least to those writers who favoured the supremacy of the Roman see ; and even in Africa the appeal made to him by the Donatists occasioned some inconvenience to St. Augustine. It is therefore, as we have said, not only to the intrinsic value of his writings that we must look to account for his popularity ; and we shall not be wrong in emphasizing first his reputation as a statesman, and secondly his fame as a martyr. Origen or Tertullian may have surpassed him as scholars and theologians, Irenæus of Lyons and Dionysius of Alexandria may have wielded an episcopal influence only second to his ; Perpetua and Felicitas at Karthage, Sixtus and Laurence at Rome, suffered martyrdom under circumstances equally calculated to arrest the interest and strike the imagination of the Christian world : but which of them was, like St. Cyprian, writer, statesman, and martyr in one ?

Without pausing to dwell further on the *testimonia* which might be drawn from the writings, for instance, of St. Augustine and St. Jerome, we must hasten to the still earlier witness of what we have already alluded to as the Cheltenham List. In 1885 Professor Mommsen, while working in the Philipps Library at Cheltenham—of which most that is valuable has now, alas ! found its way to Berlin—discovered in a manuscript of chronicles a list of the books of the Old and New Testaments, and of the writings of St. Cyprian. In the immediate neighbourhood of these lists were two calculations of dates, the one giving the consulship of Eusebius and Hypatius (A.D. 359), and the other that of Valentinian and Valens (A.D. 365), so that there is some presumption that the lists were added by a hand contemporary with these dates ; a presumption fully borne out by Dr. Sanday's thorough investigation of the bearings of the canon of scriptural books on the place and time of its composition, of which the one is satisfactorily proved to be Africa, and the other the fourth century.<sup>2</sup> In the second half, then, of the fourth century, the writings of St. Cyprian, which were known to the African author of this list were the following : of the thirteen

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the story told by Jerome of Cyprian's daily request, 'Da magistrum.'

<sup>2</sup> *Studia Biblica*, iii. 226-74.

treatises contained in Hartel's first volume, all but one, the *Quod idola dii non sint*, reappear; of the spurious and additional matter contained in his third or appendix volume, the list includes the *Life* by Pontius and two already of the pseudo-Cyprianic works, the *De Laude Martyrii* and the *Adversus Iudæos*. To identify the rest, which are letters properly speaking, we have to guide us, in the first place, the rough titles of the list; where these are corrupt or insufficient, the parallel order of letters in one or two of our MSS.; and in the last resort the stichometry or number of lines which the list supplies for each item throughout the Biblical and Cyprianic books as a means of checking the extortionate charges and falsified totals of the booksellers.<sup>1</sup> By these means twenty-three, or perhaps we may say twenty-four, letters (besides the group to Cornelius) can be certainly recognized; and there are not more than two or three left which are identified doubtfully or not at all.<sup>2</sup> In any case there is no real reason to believe that the author of the list knew any writings as St. Cyprian's which have not come down to us.

It will have become obvious already that, granting the stages of growth of the Cyprianic literature to be such as we have described, it will be hopeless to look for even an approximation to the chronological order. The possessor of a small collection added to it at haphazard whenever he fell in with another, and the same process was repeated time after time until the larger collections as we have them in the later MSS. were complete; sometimes, indeed, it even happened that the same letter appears twice in one MS., and with a text so different as to indicate a different genealogy, and a different moment of accession.<sup>3</sup> To follow the order of the MSS. or any of them in a printed text, would only be to court confusion, and it has been one of the chief problems confronting the editors of St. Cyprian to reduce this chaos into a harmonious and orderly arrangement. In Pamelius's edition of 1568 order is beginning to appear; and yet even

<sup>1</sup> 'Quoniam indiculum versuum in urbe Roma non ad liquidum, sed et alibi avariciæ causa non habent integrum per singulos libros computatis syllabis posui numeros xvi versum Virgilianum omnibus libris numerum adscripsi.' The sense is clear if the words are not; our compiler counted all through each book of the Bible and of St. Cyprian, reckoning according to custom sixteen syllables as equal to one στίχος or Virgilian hexameter.

<sup>2</sup> Epp. 2, 10, 11, 20, 28, 30, 32, 37, 38, 39, 40, 54, 55, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69 pt. i., 71, 73, 74, 78, 79 and probably 70; doubtful ones are Epp. 72, 76, 6.

<sup>3</sup> Such is the case with the Oxford MS. called by Dr. Sanday O., where Ep. 58 (*ad Thibaritanos*) is repeated.

this a  
advan  
be sa  
group  
relati  
Vien  
ledge  
tent t  
a cha  
mon  
was n  
receiv  
out o  
Albre  
dix o  
variati  
to the  
St. C.  
Oxfon  
rianic  
Bisho  
profou  
autho  
elapse  
Space  
writen  
to the  
the R  
with  
corres

For  
logue  
of the  
*Depos*  
we le  
A.D. 2  
not t  
canno  
and t  
of his  
back  
death

<sup>1</sup> E  
late in  
<sup>2</sup> T



this attempt is disfigured by palpable blots.<sup>1</sup> A great step in advance was taken by the Oxford edition of 1682, which may be said to have distinguished once for all the chief historical groups, though still leaving room for discussion as to the true relation of the members of each group to one another. Hartel's Vienna edition of 1871, which did so much for the knowledge of MSS. and the critical apparatus of the text, was content to adopt the Oxford arrangement; and it has since found a champion even in details in Archbishop Benson's admirable monograph in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. But it was not to be expected that this, which may be called the received opinion, should pass in the present generation without challenge; and an essay on Cyprian by Otto (son of Albrecht) Ritschl, published in 1885, contains a short appendix on the chronology in which a considerable amount of variation in detail is suggested. Before, however, we can pass to the letters themselves and trace out in them the course of St. Cyprian's episcopate, we must follow the example of the Oxford edition, and say something about the *Annales Cyprianici*. No one can cast even the most hasty glance at Bishop Pearson's wonderful piece of work without being profoundly impressed with the skill and erudition of its author; but it was inevitable that the two centuries since elapsed should have added to and corrected our knowledge. Space forbids us to discuss in detail the points in which older writers seem to have gone wrong; we can only give, according to the most modern authorities, the dates and successions of the Roman bishops and the Roman emperors contemporary with Cyprian as a sort of framework into which to fit his correspondence.

For the Popes, our guides are the Liberian Papal catalogue of A.D. 354, and the two related lists published with it of the commemoration days at Rome of popes and martyrs, *Depositio Episcoporum* and *Depositio Martyrum*. From these we learn that Fabian was martyred on January 20 or 21, A.D. 250. We know from Cyprian that the next election did not take place very much before Easter A.D. 251; but it cannot have been after it, for the 'two years, three months, and ten days' of Cornelius, and the 'eight months ten days' of his successor Lucius, give almost three years to be reckoned back from Lucius's death on March 5, A.D. 254. Cornelius's death must have occurred in June, A.D. 253.<sup>2</sup> Lucius' successor,

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.*, Ep. 6, really one of the first letters, appears eight years too late in connexion with the persecution, not of Decius, but of Valerian.

<sup>2</sup> The older critics, following St. Jerome's statement in his *Catalogus*,

Stephen, reigned over three years, and died on August 2, A.D. 257. Finally, Xystus, after barely a year's episcopate, was martyred a month before Cyprian, August 6, A.D. 258.

The more fragmentary evidence of numismatics, epigraphy, and history is by modern writers combined to restore the imperial chronology somewhat as follows. Decius became undisputed emperor and master of Rome in the autumn of A.D. 249. Persecution followed immediately until the advance of the Goths called the emperor away to a campaign on the Danube, where he fell in battle about the November of A.D. 251. His successor was Trebonianus Gallus, whose lax administration soon provoked a revolt, and Æmilianus seized the throne, perhaps in August A.D. 253, only to be dethroned and put to death in turn, after a few weeks' reign, by Gallus's representative Valerian, who, with his son Gallienus, retained the reins of power until after St. Cyprian's martyrdom.<sup>1</sup>

To return now to St. Cyprian. Of the eighty-one extant letters, all were written by or addressed to him during the years of his episcopate, and, with a few exceptions of quite uncertain date, all of them fall into some four well-marked classes. Thirty-nine (Epp. v.-xliii.) belong to the period of his absence from Karthage occasioned by the Decian persecution; twenty-three (Epp. xlv.-lxi., lxiv.-lxviii.) are occupied with the questions which rose out of the persecution after its close and after Cyprian's return to his see; the Rebaptism controversy accounts for seven (Epp. lxix.-lxxv.); the last six (Epp. lxxvi.-lxxx.) belong to Valerian's persecution and to the closing year of Cyprian's life; while the six remaining (Epp. i.-iv., lxii. and lxiii.) deal with isolated questions and lie outside the general development of the history. On the present occasion our task will be confined to the letters of the first two classes—that is, to the Decian persecution and the Novatianist schism; and, taking as our guide the chronological framework just constructed, we shall attempt to place the correspondence in rough order as we go.

Before the outbreak of the Decian persecution, the Church had been in the enjoyment for many years of a period of that Cyprian suffered 'eodem die quo Romæ Cornelius sed non eodem anno,' naturally placed Cornelius with Cyprian on September 14. But we know from the Liberian Catalogue that Cornelius died at Centumcellæ, and September 14 was perhaps the day of the translation of his remains to Rome. See generally Lightfoot, *Clement*, i. 246-56, 287-90.

<sup>1</sup> An outline of the material for the reconstruction will be found in Cagnat's *Cours d'Épigraphie Latine*, ed. 2, p. 196.

profound and unexampled peace. It was nearly forty years since the death of Severus relieved her of her latest enemy upon the throne of the Cæsars, and the tendencies of the mainly Oriental emperors who followed were favourable rather than otherwise to an Oriental religion. For one brief moment indeed it seemed that the barbarian Maximin would direct upon Christianity the hatred he felt for everything in which his predecessor, Alexander Severus, had been interested. But if such was his design, it was frustrated by his own death; and the banishment to Sardinia of Pontianus the Bishop, and Hippolytus the schismatic suffragan, of the see of Rome, with the contemporary local outbreak in Cappadocia recorded by Firmilian of Cæsarea, are the only acts of persecution which history has put upon record to break the continuity of a period when Alexander placed the image of Christ in his chapel and copied Christian customs in the statute book, or when Philip the Arabian (at least according to the story as it ran half a century later) consented to be ranked among the penitents in the Christian congregation. Nor was this change of attitude towards the Church confined to high places. Half a century of free intercourse between the Church and the world had at least shown the baselessness of the old calumnies which out of the secrecy and mystery of the Christian worship of earlier generations had evolved the charges of cannibal banquets and promiscuous intercourse, and had taught people that if a Christian differed from his neighbours in morals, he differed for the better. But it was beginning to be doubtful, at least in some places, whether he really differed much at all. When the ease of the hereditary Christian began to replace the ardour of the convert, and the sense of imperial favour relaxed the uncompromising sternness of the times when every day might bring forth a martyrdom, the whole attitude of the Church underwent a change, irresistible, indeed, in the nature of things, but none the less fought against and lamented by the more fiery spirits of that generation. The perpetual exclusion from communion with which the Western Church, at least at the end of the second century, had visited what were called the 'mortal' sins of murder, idolatry, adultery, and perhaps fraud, was exchanged in the case of one class of sins after another for a definite term of penance.<sup>1</sup> Nay, before the end of the period, if we are to trust St. Cyprian's picture of the African episcopate,<sup>2</sup> the bishops, instead of guarding the morals of their flocks, set themselves the example of neglect

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cyprian, Ep. lv. 20, 21, 27.

<sup>2</sup> Cyprian, *De Lapsis*, 6; cf. Newman's *Callista*, ch. ii.

of duty by turning their whole energies to secular business and deserting their dioceses whenever the exigencies of trade required their presence elsewhere. We must beware, indeed, of accepting the exaggerated conception which the excited minds of the survivors of the persecution projected back upon the preceding years, as they saw in the failure of the Church to meet the blow the Divine judgment upon the sins which had provoked it; but the ordinary standard of the African Christianity of those days was obviously not calculated to produce the stuff of which confessors and martyrs were made, and proportionate was the alarm when Philip's successor, Decius, the honourable bearer of an honourable name, set himself to restore the old glories of Rome by a determined onslaught alike on the Gothic enemies of her frontiers, and on the Christian enemies of her institutions.

The persecution of Decius is memorable as the first and most disastrous of the general persecutions which the State waged against the Church. In the second century the initiative had come always from the populace or the magistrate, and the persecutions in consequence, frequent as they must have been, were local and spasmodic. Severus had directed an edict against proselytism and proselytes, but not against Christianity as a whole. It was reserved for Decius to pit the whole forces of the State in a systematic and organized effort to crush a power which men were now beginning to gauge more truly as an antagonist, not indeed of the morals, but of the very existence of the Roman State. Humanly speaking, such an effort on the part of Nero or Domitian might have been successful; but if two centuries of growth had increased the number of Christians so much that it would be impossible directly to annihilate them, they had also taught the politic Roman how and where to strike with most effect.

A few months only after the accession of Decius, the first overt signal of the persecution was given by the martyrdom of Fabian, Bishop of Rome, on January 20, 250 A.D. But doubtless it was not entirely unexpected. Even before the news arrived in Africa, Cyprian, only lately elected bishop, had already, avoiding by anticipation a similar fate, and acting, as he believed, in accordance with Divine admonition, retired from his see and was directing the Karthaginian community from a distance. He was in hopes, we gather, that the danger of popular outbreaks against the Christians would be minimized when once the 'invidious presence' of the bishop was withdrawn; and probably enough he foresaw the consequences of anarchy and schism were his death to leave the

Church  
case, t  
vacan  
mitig  
251) a  
episco  
foreca  
expos  
find a  
Roma  
perty  
really  
the g  
possib  
hiding  
ginian  
confer  
seems  
'bloo  
him t  
occidi  
hand,  
marty  
the im  
to wea  
its vict  
numbe  
Cy  
would  
of a sp  
letters  
of dire  
in pris  
of the  
forced  
ings o  
ment a  
or dea  
forth n  
the cle  
and p

<sup>1</sup> Cf  
<sup>2</sup> Ep  
EPISCO  
<sup>3</sup> Ep

Church to face the storm without a head. If such was the case, the actual results at Rome—where towards the close of the vacancy of fifteen months (from the death of Fabian till the mitigation of persecution permitted an election in March A.D. 251) ambition and dissension ran so high as to lead to the rival episcopates of Cornelius and Novatian—more than justified his forecast. It was obvious, however, that such a step would expose him at once to misconception, and we do seem to find a tone of something like contempt in the letters of the Roman clergy and the Karthaginian confessors.<sup>1</sup> His property was confiscated;<sup>2</sup> but where he went, and whether he really succeeded in removing himself beyond the reach of the government, we do not know. It is at least not impossible, that even if Decius or his officials had wind of his hiding-place, they would have preferred to leave the Karthaginian prelate under the odium of an absentee rather than to confer on him the dignity of a martyr. For the emperor seems to have grasped as strongly as Tertullian the truth that 'blood was the seed of the Church.' It was no object with him to make martyrs: 'cupientibus mori non permitteretur occidi,' is Cyprian's rather pathetic complaint. On the other hand, in proportion to the credit conferred on the Church by a martyrdom was the disgrace incurred over an apostacy; and the imperial policy, by the employment of tortures calculated to wear out the strength but not to put an end to the life of its victims, was only too successful in producing the maximum number of apostates with the minimum of martyrs.

Cyprian's retirement did not obviate, as he had trusted it would, a breach of the peace. One letter only expresses the hope of a speedy settlement and return; the next two are companion letters, the one of encouragement to the confessors, the other of directions to the clergy about visiting and supporting them in prison.<sup>3</sup> But so far the persecution was only a symptom of the popular feeling which, excited by the news from Rome, forced the local magistrates to anticipate the formal proceedings of the law. Confession was followed only by imprisonment and exile. Still, although nothing is said yet of torture or death, the mere anticipation of what was to come called forth many apostacies among the laity, and some even among the clergy; and the corresponding feeling of self-satisfaction and pride among those who had confessed was followed on

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Epp. viii. xxiii.; also Ep. lxvi.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. lxvi. 4, SI QVIS TENET POSSIDET DE BONIS CAECILI CYPRIANI EPISCOPI CHRISTIANORVM.

<sup>3</sup> Ep. vii. is the earliest, then Epp. v. vi.

their release and return by an outbreak of insubordination and indifference to morals auguring ill for a Church which had still to experience the real brunt of the persecution. Possibly the magistrates had exceeded their powers; possibly they were inclined to stretch a point in favour of the accused Christians when it could be done with safety. At any rate, the proconsular governor of the province, whose duty it was to see to the execution of the edict, was absent from Karthage—perhaps going on circuit through the province, perhaps not yet arrived from Rome—and a lull ensued till his arrival, when the full forces of the State, on the lines mapped out by the emperor, were put into action with results disastrous to the Church. The number who stood firm was small in comparison with those who yielded. Many who had withstood the first trial now submitted and sacrificed, and the crisis called forth from the bishop a passionate entreaty, reinforced by appeals to visions which had been granted him, to unanimity and prayer.<sup>1</sup> Still the widespread fall only threw into higher relief the constancy of the few, who, having endured torture, were now, according to the established usage, entitled to the name not merely of confessors but of martyrs, and Cyprian's first letter to them under this title is like a pæan of triumph. At least one of them, Mappalicus, had died under the torture, and as he is commemorated in April,<sup>2</sup> the reference to his death gives us the first fixed date of the Karthaginian persecution.

The situation in Karthage developed in a way that was not difficult to foresee. The vast multitude of apostates had by their lapse *ipso facto* excluded themselves from the communion of the Church; and if the ancient system for which Tertullian and Hippolytus had fought, and for which Novatian was to sacrifice the unity of the Church, was to be maintained in all its lifelong rigour, these people, Christians of course still in heart, would never have been able to call themselves Christians in name again. It is likely enough that the emperor or his ministers may have counted upon this as one of

<sup>1</sup> Ep. xi. This epistle is preceded by two companion letters to the confessors and clergy, Epp. xiii. xiv., and also by Ep. xii.; and is followed by Ep. x. The order of this group comes out (1) from the internal indications of the progress of the persecution contained in them; (2) from the connected summary of them given by Cyprian himself in Ep. xx. 2. Our reconstruction of the Oxford arrangement agrees so far with that of Ritschl.

<sup>2</sup> April 17 is given by Archbishop Benson in *Dict. Christian Biog.*, s.v. 'Aristo'; April 19 in the Karthaginian kalendar, ap. Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*.

the  
weap  
one,  
that  
than  
migh  
favour  
with  
soon  
posit  
their  
exerc  
witho  
each  
embr  
not o  
clergy  
full c  
or ho  
sent  
peopl  
revolu  
carrie  
obvio  
conte  
ganise  
marty  
them,  
unwri  
to the  
episco  
the cl  
as it s  
the co  
thems  
vanity  
lapsed  
appea  
adjudi  
of pea  
Ei  
tory;  
seemed



the results of their policy ; and it would have been a terrible weapon in their hands. But there was at least one, if only one, resource open to the apostate. Ancient custom ruled that the martyrs, the constancy of whose confession more than counterbalanced the scandal of their companions' fall, might recommend individual cases among the latter for the favourable consideration of the authorities of the Church, with a view to the ultimate restoration of communion. No sooner, then, were Mappalicus and others in this privileged position, than the lapsed naturally trooped in crowds to secure their potent intercession. Some, like Mappalicus himself, exercised their powers with care and moderation ; others, without pretence of examination into the circumstances of each applicant, granted tickets, or *libelli* as they were called, embracing not only the applicant, but all his friends.<sup>1</sup> And not only so were the traditional cautions violated, but the clergy on the spot were readmitting possessors of tickets to full communion without exacting any public confession of sin or holding any communication with the bishop. Three letters, sent contemporaneously to the martyrs, the clergy, and the people,<sup>2</sup> show us St. Cyprian face to face with this widespread revolt against his authority. The laity, who had probably carried his election to the bishopric, and on whom he was obviously accustomed to lean for support against the discontent of at least a section of the presbyters, were disorganised by the fall of so many among their body. The martyrs, pressed by the lapsed, and not disinclined, some of them, to use to the utmost the position which, by a sort of unwritten sanction, the gratitude of the Church accorded to them, were in no mood to respect the interference of episcopal claims or ecclesiastical discipline. And a party of the clergy had resented Cyprian's elevation against their own, as it seemed, superior claims, and saw, in his absence and in the conditions of the times, an opportunity for arrogating to themselves the practical direction of affairs by flattering the vanity of the confessors and remitting the penance of the lapsed. Thus, in the first stage of the controversy Cyprian appears as the upholder of canonical rigour. No case can be adjudicated upon without the bishop or before the restoration of peace to the Church.

Either Cyprian was impatient or his correspondents dilatory ; for an answer from Karthage was expected in vain. It seemed likely that the Karthaginian and the Roman clergy

<sup>1</sup> Ep. xv. 4 : 'Communicet ille cum suis.'

<sup>2</sup> Epp. xv. xvii. xviii.

appreciated equally an interval of presbyterian government. Anxious, then, to strengthen his position by avoiding all reasonable cause of offence through over-severity, now that summer had begun—perhaps it was June by this time—and an increase of mortality was therefore to be expected, he directed that holders of *libelli* from the martyrs might be readmitted *in articulo mortis*.<sup>1</sup> This concession (which was followed by a reopening of communications from Karthage) had the further advantage of putting his policy in line with that already expressed by the Roman clergy, who had written to him after his retirement to relate the martyrdom of Fabian, and at the same time had sent to the clergy at Karthage a curious epistle (which fell into the bishop's hands), unsigned and ungrammatical, full of obscure references to hireling shepherds, and of instructions how to govern the flock in their stead, the readmission of sick penitents being especially inculcated. At that moment Cyprian had only written to acknowledge the one letter and to return the other as being presumably a forgery.<sup>2</sup> But now, especially in presence of the mutiny in his own camp, he was looking abroad to find allies for the campaign; for the independent concurrence of each bishop and diocese in united and consistent action was the keynote of his ecclesiastical system, an ideal which he never tired of enforcing in theory and practice. The whole series of thirteen letters are forwarded as a justification of policy and a claim on their support to the one great Church across the sea with which Karthage stood in the closest relations of accessibility and intercourse.<sup>3</sup> Throughout Africa he circulates a group of the five latest; and there his colleagues, probably feeling that they had at their head a stronger man than themselves, seem to have acquiesced in his lead, and consulted him on points arising out of the application of his principles.<sup>4</sup> In Karthage itself, if a few of his clergy were prepared to go to all lengths against him, the majority had now rallied to his side. But the martyrs—to whom alone he had used the language of entreaty and respect rather than of command—represented or misrepresented by Lucian, one of their number, proceeded to announce to the bishop, in laconic but decisive terms, that they had settled the whole question for him and his colleagues.

<sup>1</sup> Epp. xviii. (cf. Ep. ix. 3) xix.

<sup>2</sup> Epp. viii. ix. Perhaps the Roman letter emanated from one section only of the clergy.

<sup>3</sup> Ep. xxi.; cf. Ep. xxvi.

<sup>4</sup> Epp. xv.-xix. xxiv. xxv.

'All the confessors to Pope Cyprian greeting. You should know that we all of us have granted peace to those who have established before you the character of their conduct since their fall; and we will that this decision become known through you to the rest of the bishops as well. We trust you may have peace with the holy martyrs. Of the clergy both an exorcist and a reader are present; Lucian is the scribe.'

Happily, a later letter from the same martyr, in answer to a request for a *libellus* for two ladies from Celerinus, of whom we shall hear again, gives us another side of the picture, and shows us the poor fellow worn out with his sufferings, in the act of being starved to death, and 'so tired' that he cannot write out all the names of those to whom he wishes to send greetings.<sup>1</sup>

The main interest of the groups of epistles which now follow is transferred from Africa to Italy. Sixteen letters (Epp. xxviii.-xl.iii.) cover a period of perhaps some six months from the autumn of A.D. 250 onwards, during which the episcopal chair was still unoccupied in both cities; for Cyprian could not return, nor the Roman clergy elect a bishop, until about Easter of A.D. 251. The attempt to range these epistles in chronological order is complicated by the triangular character of the series—for Cyprian still had Karthaginian as well as Roman correspondents—and by the fact that more than once letters from and to Rome seemed to have crossed one another. The season was winter, when no doubt the communication across the Mediterranean was less speedy; and besides the voyage from Karthage to the Tiber or *vice versa*, there was the land transit to reckon in between Cyprian's hiding-place and his metropolis. Nor were Cyprian's letters written with the idea of keeping up at stated intervals communications between the churches, but solely as forwarding necessary information about important developments in the controversy, which might follow one another slowly at one time, rapidly at another. Thus letters from the clergy and confessors at Rome to the clergy and confessors at Karthage, though they reached Cyprian at the moment when he was despatching to Rome a second batch of correspondence, had certainly been written before the arrival of the original batch at its destination; and similarly Cyprian's third letter, with its enclosures, was perhaps sent before the receipt of the answers to his previous one.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Epp. xxiii. xxi. xxii. In the group of letters Epp. xv.-xxvi. we have disagreed from Ritschl so far as to put Epp. xxi. xxii. at the end, instead of at the beginning of the series.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. xxvii. encloses Epp. xxi.-xxvi.; Ep. xxvii. 4, xxviii. 2, mention

However, the news from Rome when it came was encouraging beyond expectation; for the Romans, who had scarcely veiled their opinion of the bishop's flight, proved, as might have been expected, to be no lenient critics of the policy of laxity which had found favour with the clergy and the confessors at Karthage. Such, we gather from Cyprian's allusions, was the drift of their first pair of letters, unfortunately not extant; such is certainly the theme worked out at length in the second pair addressed to the bishop himself in answer to his congratulations on the identity of the policy which had thus been independently arrived at in the government of the two churches.<sup>1</sup> No readmissions will be granted to the lapsed at Rome, write the clergy, until the persecution has ceased, until the bishop's chair is filled, until the fullest consideration has been given to the question as a whole both by the Roman Church and the Church at large. An exception, indeed, is still made in favour of the dying; and the repetition becomes noteworthy, when we learn later on that it was no other than Novatian who acted as spokesman of his colleagues in drawing up the letter on this second occasion. It is not surprising that the standpoint of the Roman confessors, as expressed in the companion missive, is practically identical, though expressed with less detail; for the principal confessors were the presbyters Moses and Maximus, the former of whom is specially mentioned as subscribing with the clergy, while his name also stands at the head of the letter of the confessors.<sup>2</sup>

Before these letters arrived in Karthage, the lapsed, or a party of them, had made one last desperate effort to cow their bishop into accepting them on the martyrs' terms, and wrote to him, not as individuals—no names were attached—but as themselves constituting the body of the Church. Their letter is lost, but its tenor can be reconstructed from Cyprian's reply (refusing their request, and contrasting them unfavourably over it with some of their fallen brethren), and the arrival of the two (lost) letters from the Roman clergy and confessors respectively. Ep. xxxv., his next letter, does not mention that he had yet received the Roman letters (in answer to his Epp. xxvii. xxviii.) Epp. xxx. xxxi.

<sup>1</sup> Cyprian to the Roman clergy, in the postscript to Ep. xxvii., to the confessors in Ep. xxviii.; the answer of the clergy in Ep. xxx., that of the confessors in Ep. xxxi. But it is not impossible that Ep. xxx. is a direct answer to Ep. xx., Cyprian's first letter, only; and that it was sent before Ep. xxvii. had reached Rome. The close connection in the Cheltenham List and elsewhere of Epp. xxxii. (a letter enclosing others to Karthage), xx. xxx. suggests this view.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Epp. xxx. 8, lv. 6.

from the description he gives of it when forwarding it to his own and to the Roman clergy respectively.<sup>1</sup> From the latter he received in answer a reiterated assurance of their support.<sup>2</sup>

Some time during the autumn, and after this interchange of correspondence, Celerinus, of whom we have already heard as a correspondent of Lucian's, arrived in Karthage. He was certainly, if not, as is probable, himself a Karthaginian, at least of a Karthaginian stock; but he had been amongst the confessors at Rome, for he had faced the 'chief and author of the troubles,' the 'vanguard of Antichrist,' who can be no other than Decius himself.<sup>3</sup> Released by some means from prison—perhaps the fury of persecution was already slackening—he crossed the sea, and brought to Cyprian direct intelligence of and from the martyrs; and the bishop took advantage of the occasion to write again to Moses and his companions in tones that recall the pæan he had addressed some months earlier to the prisoners at Karthage. Putting together the fragmentary allusions of several letters, we can see that the persecution in Rome, while it had followed the same general lines as in Africa, bore in details still more clearly the characteristic stamp of the emperor's policy. At Karthage the number of deaths of those who succumbed to tortures or to starvation in prison was considerable; at Rome, on the other hand, the reluctance to place in the hands of the Church the weapon of martyrdom was more marked, for when Cyprian first wrote to the confessors their ranks had not yet been thinned, and the allusion in his second epistle implies that the deaths which occurred in the interval were rather the natural effects of so prolonged an imprisonment, than the actual intention of the persecutors. Chains, the stocks, shortness of food, the horrors of the inner prison, accompanied by the frequent offer of release, were relied on to break down their constancy.<sup>4</sup> Originally arrested in winter, when Cyprian wrote the second time autumn had

<sup>1</sup> Ep. xxxiii. (cf. Ep. xxix. to the Karthaginian, Ep. xxxv. to the Roman, clergy): no one seems to have noticed that the opening words of Ep. xxix. clearly allude to this pair of letters, and that Ep. xxxiii. must therefore precede Ep. xxix.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. xxxvi. obviously corresponds to and answers Ep. xxxv. The reference in xxxvi. 4 to information given about Privatus of Lambæse implies, indeed, the receipt from Cyprian of another letter besides xxxv., in which this personage is not mentioned. But as it would appear that he was not at the moment in Rome, but in Karthage, the letter referred to may be that to the Karthaginian clergy which Cyprian in Ep. xxxv. says he is sending to Rome with the rest.

<sup>3</sup> For Celerinus, see Epp. xxi. xxii. 1, xxvii. 3, xxxvii. 1, xxxix. 2, 3.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Epp. xxii. 2, xxviii. 1, xxxvii. 1, 3, xxxix. 2.

come round, and the cycle of the seasons was complete. It cannot have been long after this, about the beginning of A.D. 251, that the presbyter Moses, the chief among the confessors, earned by his death in prison the title of 'martyr.'<sup>1</sup>

Of Cyprian's letters during this period to his own clergy, some are occupied simply with forwarding copies of his correspondence, some with announcing the ordinations and appointments which, under normal circumstances, would have been made after full consultation with the council of clergy, but which the necessity of the times and the paucity of clerics compelled him to undertake without their assistance. Even so he is careful to point out that in no case has he relied entirely on his own initiative. If Saturus and Optatus are made, the one a reader, the other a subdeacon, in order as clergy to convey episcopal communications to Rome, they had long ago been placed by common consent among candidates for minor orders. On the other hand, when Aurelius and Celerinus are advanced to the office of reader, it is pointed out that their position as confessors is a divine witness to their fitness for clerical duties, substituted for the public examination of character necessary in other cases. Lastly, the enrolment of Numidicus, already a presbyter of some other church, among the presbyters of Karthage, is justified on the triple ground of his confessorship, of the lapse of so many other presbyters, and besides of a direct divine intimation.<sup>2</sup>

Meanwhile, as the persecution abated, the controversy over the readmission of the lapsed, if fought out upon a narrower area, had entered an acuter stage. While Cyprian, in his plea for delay and his refusal to decide the question offhand, was supported by the majority of his clergy and people, a party in Karthage were pushing side by side the claims of the lapsed, with whom they began to communicate freely, and their own opposition to the bishop's authority. The commissioners to whom Cyprian about this time gave powers to act as his representatives—Caldonius and Herculanus, African bishops, whose sees presumably lay near the capital, and Rogatianus and Numidicus, confessors and presbyters of Karthage itself—reported Felicissimus and Augendus as ringleaders of the sedition, and with the primate's authority excluded them and certain of their followers—women as well

<sup>1</sup> Ep. lv. 6 : cf. *Liberian Catalogue* (Lightfoot, *Clement*, i. 255), 'post passionem [Fabiani] . . . in carcerem sunt missi . . . Moyses in carcere defunctus est, qui fuit ibi m. xi, d. xi.'

<sup>2</sup> Epp. xxix, xxxviii, xxxix, xl.



as men—from communion.<sup>1</sup> It soon appeared, however, that the ramifications of the movement were spread wider and deeper still, and that Felicissimus was only the mouthpiece, perhaps the cat paw, of Novatus, who had made him his deacon, and of certain other presbyters, five in all with their chief, the representatives and survivors of the original opposition to the bishop's election. In the last letter of an exile by this time prolonged into a second year, Cyprian, writing shortly before the Easter of A.D. 251, which fell on March 23, complains bitterly that it was their machinations which had prevented his returning in time to keep Easter in his diocese. A fresh outbreak of persecution, he learnt, was to be anticipated in the event of his arrival, and this he declined for his flock's sake to risk; but whether he was right in charging the presbyters with being accessories before the fact, and if so, by what underhand means they can have proposed to secure their end, it is impossible to say.<sup>2</sup> Before he reached Karthage they were excluded from communion by some of his colleagues—perhaps the former, perhaps a second and larger, commission—acting on the principles Cyprian had already laid down for their guidance; whereupon the malcontents immediately sent Novatus, and with him, perhaps, Augendus, to organize in the imperial city an alliance among the presbyterate of the Roman Church.

When Cyprian wrote in March, the news of the election of Cornelius as Bishop of Rome had not yet had time to reach him. We may conjecture that it was the same slackening of persecution, owing to the Gothic advance in the Danube provinces, which enabled the election of the one bishop and the return of the other;<sup>3</sup> for the independent evidence of the Papal lists shows that the Roman election cannot have taken place later than March, as the correspondence of Cyprian shows that it can scarcely have been much earlier. It was a triumph, perhaps an unexpected triumph, for the party of moderation,

<sup>1</sup> Ep. xli. xlii. Ep. xxxiv. should be placed in connection with these two; it treats similarly of a presbyter and deacon (perhaps not Karthaginian), who had communicated with the lapsed, but it is addressed to the clergy, not to the commission, and therefore is either slightly earlier or slightly later.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. xliii. For the condemnation of the presbyters, see Ep. xlv. 4, lix. 9. Cyprian was not present, for he always speaks of it in the third person; nor is it likely that he had returned, but declined to be present, as Archbishop Benson suggests. Ep. lix. 15 shows that there were only a few bishops acting with presbyters and deacons; perhaps nine was the exact number (lix. 10; but this may refer to some other local synod).

<sup>3</sup> But cf. Ep. lv. 9, where Cyprian speaks as if Cornelius might have anticipated immediate death at the hands of the furious emperor.

which at Rome meant the party of opposition to the austerer policy of the more prominent clergy and confessors. Like Hippolytus a generation earlier, Novatian, the leader of the extremists, was incomparably the greatest theologian of the Roman Church; but it was characteristic of the electors that the qualities for which they looked in their bishop were those of the practical statesman, and Novatian had no doubt already committed himself—inconsistently (as Cyprian later on pointed out) with the letter written six or eight months before to Karthage—to the uncompromising exclusion of all the lapsed from any hope of restoration to Church communion. When the popular choice fell upon Cornelius, the supporters of Novatian issued an immediate protest, and the customary letters of the new bishop announcing his consecration reached Karthage (whither Cyprian had now returned) by the same post as a budget of calumnious charges against him. The Bishop of Karthage had been so prominent an opponent of laxity, that confident hopes were built by the Roman puritans upon his adhesion to their cause; but emphatic as was his stress upon the need for discipline, he had never committed himself to more than delay in the reception of the lapsed, and his whole theory of the Church summed itself up in the harmonious action of an independent episcopate, representing by free election each local church. It was not, therefore, unnatural, that while formal recognition of the new bishop was delayed until two African representatives, Caldonius and Fortunatus, had visited Rome to learn on the spot, and from the consecrators, the actual truth about the dispute, and to attempt to effect a reconciliation, a presumption in favour of the *fait accompli* was so far admitted, that the letter of Cornelius was, while the charges of Novatian were not, read out in the presence of the Karthaginian Church.<sup>1</sup> The council adjourned until the commissioners should return, and we find Cyprian at Hadrumetum enforcing the *ad interim* decision, and directing that letters to Rome should meanwhile be addressed to the clergy still, rather than to Cornelius. But the report of Caldonius and his colleague was anticipated, on the one hand by the arrival not only of letters from Cornelius complaining of the delay and from his consecrators guaranteeing the genuineness of his election and ordination, but of two bishops in person—Pompeius and Stephanus—who had

<sup>1</sup> It has been usually supposed, in reliance on the concluding words of Ep. xlv. 2, that Novatian's first protest was temperate and was read out. But the words really mean that Cyprian only read what was temperately expressed—that is, only Cornelius and not Novatian at all.

been  
a de  
had  
the  
Cyp  
the  
extr  
clue  
siti  
seem  
the  
grou  
of t

the  
the  
selv  
ing,  
of t  
Cyp  
veyi  
a de  
this  
dial  
hope  
leas  
as th  
appe  
priv  
men  
to th  
was  
of re  
sym  
of h  
willi  
brou

1  
to pr  
quen  
again  
cours  
2  
Ep. x  
3  
Cald

been present at the time in Rome; while, on the other hand, a deputation from Novatian announced that the extreme step had been taken of setting up an antipope. Strange to say, the puritan extremists in Rome were supported—nay, if Cyprian is to be taken literally (Ep. lii. 2), were incited to the schismatic consecration of Novatian—by the antinomian extremists from Karthage. But when we remember that the clue to the policy of the latter at home had lain in their opposition to the bishop, it is less surprising than at first sight it seems that these Karthaginian clergy should have seconded the opposition of a party of Roman clergy, regardless of the grounds on which it was based, to the episcopal nomination of the Roman Church.

The African synod hesitated no longer. Whatever claims the minority might have had to be heard on the question of the validity of Cornelius's appointment, they had put themselves completely out of court by this outrageous proceeding, rendered the more odious in Karthage by the accession of the ex-Karthaginian presbyters; and two letters from Cyprian to Cornelius followed one another quickly, conveying the fullest recognition of his episcopate, together with a defence of the hesitation and caution which had prevented this being given before.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, Cyprian's previous cordial relations with the Roman confessors emboldened him to hope that his personal intervention might detach them at least from the side of Novatian, and by the same messenger as the second of his letters to Cornelius he forwarded a brief appeal to the confessors and a postscript, or perhaps rather a private note, to Cornelius, in which it was left to his judgment whether or no this communication should be delivered to them.<sup>2</sup> Cornelius's answer to the first letter showed that he was still far from being satisfied, and no doubt the same chain of reasoning which led the Novatianists to count on Cyprian's sympathy caused the Roman bishop to suspect the sincerity of his adhesion. Indeed, his attitude is illustrated by the willing ear which, a full year later, he lent to the accusations brought against his Karthaginian colleague.<sup>3</sup> But the second

<sup>1</sup> Epp. xlv. and xlv., though sent by different messengers, do not seem to present any very material difference in the situation, and it is consequently not easy to say which is earliest. But we agree with Pearson against Ritschl, believing Ep. xlv. to be a hasty announcement of the course which is explained and defended at greater length in Ep. xlv.

<sup>2</sup> Epp. xlv. and xlvii., sent by Mettius the sub-deacon, mentioned in Ep. xlv. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Ep. xlviii. 1, lix. 2. Cyprian's reply (Ep. xlviii.) was written after Caldonius and Fortunatus had returned.

messenger, sent with the group of three letters, returned with a corresponding group of three, the contents of which were far more re-assuring for the prospects of unity. The first had, indeed, only to relate that a new Novatianist embassy, headed by Nicostratus the Roman confessor, Novatus the Karthaginian presbyter, and Evaristus an Italian bishop—representatives of the different sections of the opposition—had left Rome for Karthage. Before, however, Niceforus the acolyte had started with it, an important change occurred in the situation. Startled perhaps by the unexpected attitude of Cyprian, and moved by his appeal, the confessors remaining in Rome, of whom Maximus the presbyter Urbanus Sidonius and Macarius were the chief, conveyed to the authorities their decision to dissociate themselves from the Novatianist cause. In the presence of the Roman presbytery, assembled for the purpose under Cornelius, and of five bishops who happened that day to be visiting the city, they and their companions and followers made full and formal recantation, concluding with the pregnant words 'for we know that, as there is one God and one Lord Christ whom we have confessed, and one Holy Spirit, so ought there to be one bishop in a Catholic church.' With every demonstration of popular satisfaction all were readmitted, and Maximus was bidden to take his old seat among the presbyters. Cornelius wrote a hasty note which accompanied his previous letter, and to prevent all possibility of misconception a few lines from the four confessors were enclosed.<sup>1</sup> To these letters Cyprian replied again by a corresponding three: one to the confessors of genuine congratulation, enclosing his lately written tracts on the Lapsed and on the Unity of the Church; and two to Cornelius, to all appearance strictly contemporary, the one dealing entirely with the second, and the other almost exclusively with the first of the two letters from the Roman bishop. Possibly one of Cyprian's was meant for public reading to the Roman Church, the other for Cornelius's ears alone; possibly the one was a hasty note dashed off in the exuberance of his delight, while more depressing points were reserved for a second letter; possibly the double form of the reply was only suggested by the double form of the original.<sup>2</sup>

Over what period of time, whether it were weeks or

<sup>1</sup> Epp. l. xlix. liii. The mention of Macarius (who is named in Ep. liii, but not in Ep. xlix.) in Cyprian's answer to Cornelius (Ep. l. i), implies that Ep. liii. had been simultaneously received.

<sup>2</sup> Epp. li. lii. to Cornelius (li. answering xlix. and lii. answering l.) and liv. to the confessors.

months, this correspondence extended, we have no certain indications to decide; in any case, the further history of the Roman schism passes out of the range of the Cyprianic correspondence. Meanwhile in Africa the Novatianist deputies, rejected by the capital, attempted to seduce from their allegiance the Churches of the neighbourhood; and letters from Novatian himself indignantly rejected the charge of heresy, while they reproached Cornelius with having put himself out of the pale of the Church by communicating with the lapsed at large and in particular with Trofimius, a bishop who had sacrificed. Some bishops wavered in their support of Cornelius; and episcopal consecration was ultimately procured for Maximus, the Roman envoy, as Novatianist bishop in Karthage: but it does not appear as if, at least in the African capital, this schism was a formidable one. More danger threatened from the other side. The alliance between the two extremes of puritans and antinomians, which Novatus had done his best to bring about in Rome, was, it would seem, silently disowned in Karthage; and this may be the reason why Novatus from this time onwards disappears from the history.<sup>1</sup>

Steering his middle course, Cyprian had rejected with firmness the preposterous demands of the lapsed, and with no less firmness the episcopal claims of Novatian and therewith the theory underlying them which made the permanent refusal of re-admission to the fallen a test of communion; but, even so, the council which met at Karthage after the bishop's return, and to which we must now go back, had many delicate problems to solve and many alternatives to choose between. In cases of death-bed re-admission, was the preference hitherto shown to those who possessed the *libellus* of the martyrs to be maintained? Should anyone, thus restored in illness, chance to recover, ought he to continue in communion, or to be again excluded? Were the *libellatici*—those who had bribed the magistrates or their officials to give them certificates that they had sacrificed, when in fact they had not—to be treated identically with those who had actually sacrificed? Among the latter, was any difference to be made between the Christian who had shown no reluctance to sacrifice, and had even put force upon his friends and dependents to follow his example, and the Christian whose individual fall was qualified by the safety he secured for his household and the protection he afforded to fugitives and exiles? Balancing, then, the prin-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Epp. xlv. 3, lv. 2, lix. 9, 10, 11.

ciples of the discipline which demanded penitence proportioned to the fall, and of the charity which required forgiveness in proportion to the penitence, the Council decided that, while each bishop had on matters of this sort an indefeasible and independent right by virtue of his office, in the exercise of which he was responsible to God alone, certain lines of action should be laid down, to which it was agreed to conform. In each individual case examination was to be made on the spot into the circumstances of the fall, the amount of force which had been employed, the degree of reluctance and of repentance which had been displayed; *libellatici* were to be re-admitted at once, on the ground that it had never been formally laid down in the past, as it was now laid down for the future, that to accept a certificate of sacrificing was more or less equivalent to the act itself; *sacrificati* were for the present to be exhorted to penitence, in case of mortal sickness to be re-admitted without distinction (the privilege of the martyrs being thus ignored), and in the event of subsequent recovery not to be again excluded.<sup>1</sup> It was probably implied that on some later occasion their plea for readmission would be once more brought up. It was certainly also assumed that lapsed bishops or clergy had permanently forfeited all possibility of restoration to their official position; they had, in fact, become laymen; as such they would fall under the same rules as the rest, and if readmitted would be readmitted only to lay communion.<sup>2</sup>

The chronology of the period which follows is obscure, and the order of the letters which come next before us in the editions not satisfactory. But it is tolerably clear that two letters to African communities assume a position of things similar to that just described. Fortunatianus, Bishop of Assuræ, had sacrificed, and in consequence Epictetus had been consecrated in his place; but the ex-bishop attempted to re-assert his position, and the lapsed laity, who would thus have escaped all inconvenient consequences of their fall, not unnaturally supported him, while Cyprian, of course, wrote strongly on the other side. Less serious was the incident of Therapius, bishop of a see not named, who had re-admitted a lapsed ex-presbyter, Victor (although doubtless only to lay

<sup>1</sup> Epp. lv. 6, 13, 14, 17, lix. 14. Ep. lv., from which our knowledge of this settlement is almost exclusively derived, is a letter of Cyprian to a Numidian bishop, Antonianus, inclined to Novatianism, in defence of his own action and that of the council.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. lxvii. 6.

com  
gress  
Karth  
Thera  
collea  
admis  
there  
(toget  
nexio  
leagu  
A.D. 2  
C  
move  
counc  
selves  
counc  
year  
taken  
extre  
bisho  
from  
conse  
see, v  
noun  
at Ro  
scrib  
in A  
lay c  
exac  
press  
offici  
tive  
far t  
origi  
in w  
dark  
far a  
was  
his c  
enda  
the l  
lette

1  
of th  
2



communion), without any adequate cause, and had thus transgressed the regulations of the synod. A protest was sent to Karthage by a bishop Fidus, but it was decided that, though Therapius had acted recklessly in separating himself from his colleagues, and he was in consequence sternly rebuked, the re-admission was within his episcopal prerogative, and must therefore stand. The result was communicated to Fidus (together with an answer to a point he had raised in connexion with infant baptism) by Cyprian and sixty-six colleagues, probably the council of the Ides of May (May 15, A.D. 252), of which we shall hear in a moment.<sup>1</sup>

Clearly the question still uppermost in Africa was the movement in favour of laxity. Decisively beaten at the first council, this party had apparently for a time confined themselves to local intrigues in various quarters; but after a second council—that of the Ides of May just mentioned—had met a year after the first, and dispersed without any action being taken towards the re-admission of the lapsed generally, the extremest spirits hesitated no longer, and a combination of ex-bishops, deposed for heresy or idolatry, and claiming support from Numidia (always the hotbed of opposition to Karthage), consecrated Fortunatus as a third claimant to the metropolitan see, while at the same time they despatched Felicissimus to announce the news to, and negotiate for the support of, the Church at Rome. Cornelius and a Roman synod had indeed subscribed *in toto* to the conditions of re-admission as laid down in Africa; but the reception of Trofimus, even though only to lay communion—loyally as Cyprian had defended it—was not exactly on the lines of the Karthaginian *praxis*, and the pressure of the opposition to Novatianism no doubt led official circles in Rome to incline to laxity.<sup>2</sup> The representative of Fortunatus, notwithstanding a first rebuff, was able so far to influence Cornelius that that prelate supplemented the original draft of his next letter to Karthage by a postscript, in which he complained that Cyprian was keeping him in the dark as to African affairs, and may, perhaps, have gone so far as to hint (unfortunately the letter is not extant) that it was Cyprian's unpopularity and severity which had driven his diocese into rebellion, and that it might if persevered with endanger his life. To an argument of this sort Cyprian was the last man to yield. His answer forms one of the longest letters of the collection, and is an indignant 'apology' for an

<sup>1</sup> Epp. lxx. and lxxiv. : both obviously before the general re-admission of the lapsed, and therefore before Epp. lvi. lvii.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. lv. 6, 11.

episcopate which had now lasted between three and four years; if any division of opinion existed between himself and his people, it was rather that he had been too lax, and they had resented his laxity, in re-admitting the adherents of Fortunatus. We are now in the latter months of the year A.D. 252, for the excommunication of the five presbyters about March A.D. 251 belongs to 'the previous year,' and a later council is referred to as held 'on these last Ides of May.' Nothing definite is yet said of any relaxation of the penitential system, and if mention is made of 'sacrifices' which the people were bidden by official edict to celebrate—on which occasion shouts were heard in the circus of 'Cyprian to the lions'—we should be disposed to explain them as referring not to a recrudescence of persecution, of which there is no trace in this year, but to the great plague of A.D. 252, and the succeeding years, which is so prominent in the *Life* of Cyprian by the deacon Pontius.<sup>1</sup>

But in the early months of the year A.D. 253 the distant mutterings of the storm were audible once more. The new emperor, Gallus, at a moment when, as Dionysius of Alexandria<sup>2</sup> tells us, 'his reign was prosperous and everything going on as he wished,' took up the broken threads of his predecessor's policy and inaugurated a new campaign against the Church. It may be conjectured that the ravages of the plague, to which Hostilianus, the colleague of Gallus and only surviving son of Decius, succumbed in Rome, seemed to call for victims to appease the offended gods. So highly strung at this moment was the Christian consciousness, that the mere anticipation of renewed attack seemed to portend an even more fiery trial than before. When Cyprian, at the commencement of the Paschal season, received an appeal from some of his colleagues on behalf of certain brethren at Capsa who had withstood the preliminary persecution of mob and magistrates, and if they had at length yielded to torture before the proconsul had not ceased for now a third year to show genuine repentance, he expressed his own sympathy and promised to lay the matter before the bishops as soon as they had kept their Easter festival at home and had collected at Karthage; but even still he does not speak as if he anti-

<sup>1</sup> Ep. lix. : see especially I, 2, 6, 9-11, 15.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Eus. *H. E.* vii. 1. Dionysius's words imply that Gallus had been some time on the throne, for the Goths, who in November A.D. 251 had defeated Decius, must have been entirely got rid of before the course of affairs could be said to be prosperous. Therefore Pearson's Easter A.D. 252 for Epp. lvi. and lvii. is scarcely possible.

pated an immediate outbreak.<sup>1</sup> Before, however, the council met, the signs of hostile preparation on the part of the State were unmistakeable, and the question pressed for answer, whether the Church was to face the blow with half her members still excluded from communion, and therefore deprived of all the means of grace which might help them to redeem their former fall. The momentous resolution was taken to admit, after examination of individual cases, all those lapsed who, since the persecution, had lived soberly and quietly, and had neither returned to the world nor taken refuge with heresy or schism; and it was formally conveyed to Cornelius in an epistle to which were attached the names of forty-two bishops.<sup>2</sup> The tide of excitement and anticipation had swelled still higher when Cyprian, perhaps a few weeks later, wrote to the Church of Thibaris a trumpet call of no uncertain sound to the battle. Visions and warnings from heaven impressed him with the conviction that the 'day of tribulation and end of the world and time of Antichrist' was at hand; the coming conflict would not be, like the past one, transient and momentary, but the final struggle of a dying world, which should usher in the final triumph of Christ and reward of those who should be faithful to Him to the end.

Men might well tremble as they listened to the prophecy and marked the events which one by one seemed to augur the fulfilment of Cyprian's prognostications. Cornelius can hardly have received the conciliar resolutions before a sentence of banishment exiled him to Cività Vecchia. One more letter, the last of the series, reached him from Cyprian, from which we gather that the persecution had anticipated that of Valerian in striking primarily at the bishops. But the Roman Church had refused to desert its head, and a vast multitude accompanied Cornelius to his trial, confession, and exile. His death followed his banishment so quickly—not later than the middle of June—that it is natural to conjecture that it must have been hastened by the hardships he suffered; and Cyprian always speaks of him as a martyr.<sup>3</sup> A successor was appointed immediately in Lucius; and a second sentence of banishment followed.

<sup>1</sup> Ep. lvi. If the proconsul was at Capsa *after* he was at Carthage (April A.D. 250, see on Ep. x.), a 'triennium' cannot possibly be satisfied by March or early April A.D. 252. But if he had been, as is conceivable, at Capsa *first* (between January and April), the letter might perhaps be placed with Pearson at Easter A.D. 252. But this does not apply to the next letter, which must belong to A.D. 253.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. lvii.

<sup>3</sup> Ep. lx.; cf. lxi. 3, lxvii. 6, lxviii. 5.

But as suddenly as it had begun the persecution ended. In the picturesque phrase of Dionysius, the emperor had driven away with the bishops the prayers which they had offered God on his behalf. Soon after the middle of the year, Æmilianus, the commander in Moesia, after defeating the Goths, was saluted imperator and led his troops into Italy, where he achieved an easy victory over the incompetent Gallus. Lucius and his companions were recalled, or at least were tacitly allowed to return to Rome, and perhaps to bring them the relics of the deceased bishop. But when Cyprian wrote to Lucius his letter of congratulation, it was still uncertain whether the bishop had returned to exercise a peaceful episcopate or only to crown his confession by a more public martyrdom.<sup>1</sup> Even if toleration was secure at the hands of the usurper, who might be expected to reverse his predecessor's policy, Valerian was hurrying up with the German legions as the representative of Gallus, and in fact not much more than a few weeks elapsed, and the year had not yet run out, before the death of the one was avenged by the victory and succession of the other. But although the new emperor had been appointed censor by Decius, there were Christian influences in his household, and for the first few years of his reign the Church enjoyed peace once more. The death of Lucius on March 5, A.D. 254, must have been a natural one.

In the episcopate of the next pope, Stephen, who was consecrated somewhere about May 12, fall three more letters of Cyprian, which, as they still show him attacked from, or attacking, the puritan and antinomian extremists respectively, may fitly be included here. Perhaps towards the end of A.D. 254, when Cyprian had been five or six years bishop, he received a strange communication from a colleague (as it would seem), which illustrates the kind of opposition and criticism with which he had to deal. Florentius Puppianus (this was his name) had been a 'martyr' in the persecution, and scarcely disguised his contempt for Cyprian's retreat. If it was defended on the ground of divine admonitions, he hints an equal disbelief in dreams and visions. He understands that the Karthaginian Church is split in two, and all because of Cyprian. He recommends humility as the proper quality for bishops. He would like to know if his correspondent admits the truth of the charges of moral laxity, even of incest, which are being made against him. He is only writing himself in order that certain scruples which have thus

<sup>1</sup> Ep. lxi.

suggested themselves may be cleared away from his mind. That such was the tenor and such the arguments of the letter we gather from Cyprian's answer, refusing to bear testimony on his own behalf, but appealing to God's witness borne by his appointment to the episcopate, and to his communion with his people, with the martyrs and confessors, and with the Churches throughout the world.<sup>1</sup> Temperate and quiet enough at the outset, he rises at the close to a white heat of denunciation without parallel in his correspondence. No other letter but closes with a salutation; this one breaks off abruptly with the solemn warning: 'Thou hast my letter and I have thine. In the last day both shall be read aloud before the judgment seat of Christ.'

It is not clear that Puppianus had formally severed himself from Catholic communion. Two other cases are those of bishops *ipso facto* deposed either by lapse on the one side or by open adherence to Novatian on the other, and are of great interest as illustrating how the growing fame of the Karthaginian bishop elicited appeals for his interference and support all along the Latin-speaking shores of the Mediterranean. From Gaul came letters of Faustinus of Lyons, announcing that Marcianus of Arles had adopted Novatianist views, and was boasting that, far from being put out of communion by the Catholic bishops, he had himself excommunicated them; and Cyprian urges Pope Stephen to bestir himself, and not by inaction to cast a slur upon the policy of his predecessors, but to write to the bishops of the province and the church of Arles directing the excommunication of Marcianus and election of a substitute in his place.<sup>2</sup> But whatever authority is here recognised in the Roman bishop in relation to foreign communities, must on Cyprian's conception be exercised solely according to right principles, and any action violating these is null and void. Thus when Basilides, a Spanish bishop, deposed for lapse and other crimes, appealed successfully to Stephen, who directed his reinstatement, the diocese with its newly-elected successor made a counter appeal to Cyprian, who simply ignored the Roman decision, on the ground that Stephen lived a long way off and was unacquainted with the real facts of the case.<sup>3</sup> Inconsistent as Stephen's action may

<sup>1</sup> Ep. lxvi.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. lxxiii. 3. 'Dirigantur litteræ . . . quibus abstento Marciano alius in loco eius substituatur.'

<sup>3</sup> Ep. lxxvii. In this epistle the similar cases of two bishops are discussed, Basilides and Martialis, of whom one was bishop of Merida in the south-west, the other of the neighbouring cities of Leon and Astorga in the north-west, of Spain. The tone towards Stephen (cf. §§ 6-9) is less

seem with his inclination to support the Novatianist bishop of Arles, it is to be noted that Basilides and Marcianus were the original bishops of their sees, and perhaps we may suppose that the Roman bishop combined with the traditional effort to aggrandise his Church a policy in other respects which might be described by its enemies as lax and negligent, or by its supporters as tolerant and broad-minded.

Probably in this last letter may be detected the indications of the difference of temperament and divergence of view which resulted, in the great controversy about Rebaptism, in an estrangement (though never, at least on Cyprian's side, a schism) between the Roman and Karthaginian prelates. But with that, as with the closing scenes of Saint Cyprian's life in the persecution of Valerian, we cannot on the present occasion attempt to deal. Nor is it inopportune to take leave of him at a moment when he had triumphantly guided his own community and the whole Western Church through the difficulties of external trial and internal strife, pursuing his *via media*, as our own Church loves to do, at equal distance between two extremes, in the presence of assaults directed against him first from the one side and then from the other, indifferent so long as his great ideal was even approximately realized of the unity and close communion of each bishop with his Church, summed up in the communion of all bishops with one another, the symbol of the Oneness of the Holy Church Universal.

---

#### ART. VII.—MISS MOZLEY'S ESSAYS.

1. *Essays from 'Blackwood.'* By the late ANNE MOZLEY, Author of *Essays on Social Subjects*, Editor of *The Letters and Correspondence of Cardinal Newman*, *Letters of Rev. J. B. Mozley*, &c. (London, 1892.)

WHEN Anne Mozley died last summer, at the ripe of eighty-two, one of our few remaining links with the early days of the Oxford Movement was broken. Leading as she did for

cordial than in Ep. lxviii., and possibly the date is considerably later. It is to be noted that the thirty-eight bishops, whose names head the letter, reappear, all or all but one, in the great Rebaptism Council of Sept. 1, A.D. 256, and it is not an impossible hypothesis that the letter was written at the very beginning or the very end of that council, when some half of the bishops had either not yet arrived or had already left.

man  
Moz  
were  
gene  
tions  
was  
share  
The  
disap  
know  
seed  
of its  
in the  
forwa  
her b  
still  
Anne  
famor  
T  
by he  
Salis  
now g  
memo  
ing E  
imagin  
for pe  
respec  
family  
whose

At  
at the  
age of  
up to  
the in  
men o  
the wh  
kept h  
Oxford  
those  
Newm  
life.  
brothe  
many  
loved  
Cardin



many years a hidden life in her quiet Derbyshire home, Miss Mozley was almost forgotten by the world. Few of us were aware that we had lost one of the ablest women of her generation, or realized how large a store of precious recollections passed away with her into silence. Her whole existence was bound up with the Tractarian Movement. She had shared in all its struggles and lived through all its phases. The enthusiasm of its early triumphs, the deep sadness of its disappointments, its crushing sorrows and reverses, she had known them all. And she had lived long enough to see the seed sown in those dark days bear fruit in the final triumph of its principles and the wide-spread revival of religious life in the Church of the present day. Her own share in helping forward the movement was no small one. As the editor of her brother Dr. James Mozley's *Sermons and Essays*, and still more recently of Cardinal Newman's correspondence, Anne Mozley deserves a place among the members of that famous group.

These memories lend a special interest to the brief memoir by her sister Fanny and the reminiscences by the Bishop of Salisbury, which preface the volume of Miss Mozley's *Essays* now given to the public. 'It would,' says the writer of the memoir, 'have unfeignedly surprised the author of the following *Essays* had she, at any period of her long and quiet life, imagined that a memoir of her would some day be written for perusal by general readers' (p. vii). Yet she was in many respects a remarkable woman, worthy of the remarkable family to which she belonged and of the distinguished men whose intimacy she enjoyed.

Almost the whole of her life was spent either at Derby or at the neighbouring village of Barrow-on-Trent. But from the age of sixteen, when her elder brother, Thomas Mozley, went up to Oriel in 1825, she was brought into close connexion with the intellectual life of Oxford, and became familiar with the men of light and leading who were before long to influence the whole tone of religious thought in England. In 1832 she kept house for her brother at Buckland, a small parish near Oxford of which he had charge, for a short time, and during those few months she formed that close friendship with Mr. Newman and his family which was to last throughout her life. The two sisters of Mr. Newman married two of her brothers, and one of them, Mrs. John Mozley, became for many years her daily companion at Derby. This tenderly loved sister-in-law was the Jemima so often mentioned in Cardinal Newman's correspondence, the sister who entered so

closely into his deepest trials, and to whom he addressed those most pathetic letters on the eve of leaving the Church of his fathers. Anne Mozley herself was frequently a guest at Mrs. Newman's house at Littlemore, and fifty years afterwards she would recall, with singular vividness, the walks and talks, the little details and incidents, of those eventful days. And when in 1875 she once more visited those familiar scenes, and saw again the church Dr. Newman had built, and the people to whom he had ministered, she was the bearer of many kindly messages with which he had charged her for the old men and women who loved and remembered him so well.

But Miss Mozley, little as the general circle of her acquaintance was aware of the fact, had also an independent career of her own in literature. Her achievements in this field would have been sufficient to win considerable reputation had she cared for literary fame. But she shrank from notoriety of any kind, and preferred to keep her regular literary work a secret from all but the members of her own family.

'With a mind continually at work, Anne Mozley's outward life was an exclusively family and social one. Though writing and literary work had been her occupation for many years, no one out of her own family circle knew or even suspected it. Her mind, when she came downstairs from the labour of the desk, was so free from apparent preoccupation; her manner was so open, so genial; her interest in home affairs, in the lives of her friends, in public events, in the thoughts and discussions of the day, was so vivid, that suspicion was disarmed as to her having another world of her own, which for a great part of the day was indeed the world that interested her' (p. vii).

Miss Mozley's original work began in 1840. She joined heartily in the movement then set on foot to improve literature for children, and wrote a series of bright and telling stories for the young. One of these was a tale of the third century, entitled *The Captive Maiden*, which became very popular and had a wide circulation. With the same object she published several volumes of poetical selections. One of these, called *Passages from the Poets*, appeared as early as 1837. Another volume, which bore the title of *Church Poetry*, appeared in 1843, and was followed in 1845 by one called *Days and Seasons*. Both of these reached a third edition. At the same time she became the editor of that very successful periodical the *Magazine for the Young*, which Miss Yonge describes as one of the first ventures of the lovers of the Church in the way of popularizing their teaching. For many

years these little twopenny pink numbers held their place in the affections of the rising generation, and, under Miss Mozley's direction, admirably fulfilled their purpose. The editor herself only contributed two little essays to the magazine, one on cleanliness, the other on spending money; but her keen insight and talent for selection was shown in her admirable choice of contributors, and she deserves the credit of having introduced the earliest writings of the author of *The Heir of Redclyffe* to the world in the pages of this periodical.

In the year 1847 Miss Mozley began to write reviews for the *Christian Remembrancer*, of which her brother James and Mr. William Scott of Hoxton were for many years the joint editors, and continued one of its most regular contributors until it came to an end in 1868. The long series of articles from her pen are all written in the same clear and polished style, and all show the same thorough knowledge of English literature. Some of them—as, for instance, the critiques on Gray and Wordsworth—are admirable examples of literary judgment. Others are rather noteworthy as affording us an interesting glimpse of the attitude with which Browning, for instance, was regarded by his most cultured contemporaries in those days. *Paracelsus*, Miss Mozley frankly owned, puzzled her, as it did most of the ardent young poet's early critics; and although in after years she recognized the genuine inspiration of his song, and occasionally refers to his shorter poems, she never gave him her full measure of admiration and sympathy. Of some of Mrs. Browning's poetry she always speaks warmly, but neither *Aurora Leigh* nor many of the ballads were to her taste. In Tennyson's poetry, on the other hand, she took great delight, and the frequency with which she quotes his lines shows that he held a place in her affections little below her favourite Lake poets.

Besides writing these careful studies of English authors for the *Christian Remembrancer*, Miss Mozley was during many years a constant contributor both to *Blackwood* and to the *Saturday Review*. In 1864 some of her early contributions to the latter journal were republished in two volumes under the title of *Essays on Social Subjects*, with the following motto for their text: 'That man sat down to write a book to tell the world what the world had all his life been telling him.' These *Essays*, as the name implies, treat of subjects which concern readers of all sorts and conditions, and in this manner appeal to a wider circle than exclusively literary studies. But, whatever her subject may be, she has always something new

and original to tell us, some striking remark to make, which arrests our attention at the time and afterwards recurs to our memory with fresh force. Not only are the essays on general subjects very pleasant to read, not only does their easy, flowing style carry us on, wherever we happen to open the book, but the writer possesses the happy knack of lifting the dullest and most trivial questions out of their dreary surroundings, and illuminating them with a touch of elevating thought.

They were largely read at the time of their publication, and one of the volumes reached the honours of a second edition. But the name of the author was not made public, and in spite of many guesses at the authorship that all fell equally wide of the mark, the secret was never revealed during Miss Mozley's lifetime. So modestly and quietly indeed did she carry on her literary work that even her nearest neighbours remained unaware of the fact. This engrossing pursuit never absorbed her time and thoughts altogether. She taught a class of young women on Sunday, and won the hearts of her scholars by her sympathy and genuine interest in their welfare. And she devoted much time in her younger days to church needlework, and 'planned and executed delicate and tasteful embroidery for churches with the help of Pugin's book on mediæval art, when as yet such accomplishments were wholly unknown' (p. xi).

The first break in the family circle at Derby of which Miss Mozley was so important a member did not come till 1867, when her mother died. Then Anne and her younger sister Elizabeth found a new home in the pretty village of Barrow, on the banks of the broad river Trent. The recollection of that peaceful country home, the sweet beauty of its green lawn and blossoming fruit-trees, together with the kindly welcome and delightful company that were always to be found there, will not soon pass away. The charm of the place made itself felt by all. It was in its way a perfectly ideal home.

'The conversation at Barrow,' says the present Bishop of Salisbury in the recollections of Miss Mozley which he has added to her sister's memoir, 'was as good as anything in Miss Austen's novels—better, indeed, for it was more sympathetic and involved a continual recognition of the mysteries of life and the truths of religion' (p. xviii).

Miss Mozley's literary labours, her friendship with some of the most cultivated and powerful minds of her generation, kept her in full sympathy with the intellectual life of the day. Her interest in current thought, in distinguished political and

literary personalities, never flagged. She was always ready to discuss the social problems of the times, the latest novel or review that was the talk of the hour, and just as willing to turn from these sympathetic listeners to speak of the old days at Oxford and Littlemore, of the great Cardinal, and of her own brother James. Then her eyes, always remarkable for their peculiar brightness, would shine with a more tender light and her voice would thrill with emotion, as she recalled the stirring memories and intimate friends of her youth. The humility and unworldliness which were so marked a feature in many of the early followers of the Tractarian movement, the companions of Keble and Pusey, were apparent in every detail of her life. She visited the sick and helped the poor in the villages, and taught her Sunday class with as much regularity and patience as if she had no occupations or interests outside the bounds of the parish.

It was during her residence at Barrow that Miss Mozley edited the works of her brother, Dr. James Mozley, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford from 1871 to 1878. The service which she thereby rendered to the Church and the world at large deserves our undying gratitude. Until the publication of this remarkable series of works Dr. Mozley's powerful genius was little appreciated outside his university, and hardly realized in all its fulness at Oxford itself. The originality and solidity of his thought was curiously at variance with his want of fluency in giving utterance to his ideas and the difficulty which he had in disentangling them, while his fastidiousness in deciding the choice of a word or the structure of a phrase placed another hindrance in his way. Ordinary acquaintances little dreamt what burning enthusiasm and poetry, what undaunted courage and energy were hidden under that apparently cold exterior and stammering address. In his young Oxford days James Mozley's figure had been thrown into the shade by his more brilliant contemporaries, but all along he was closely associated with the leaders of the movement, and remained the intimate friend of Dr. Newman and Dr. Pusey to the end. When the great shock of 1845 came, no one felt the blow more keenly than he did. But his loyalty to his own Church never wavered, and Dean Church has lately reminded us how much his comrades owed in that dark hour to his brave and inspiring words. In 1856 he married and took the living of Shoreham, and it was not till 1871 that he came back to Oxford, when Mr. Gladstone appointed him Regius Professor of Divinity.

It was some time before Dr. Mozley could feel himself at

home in this changed and altered atmosphere. Modern Oxford at first seemed to him so altogether new, so unlike anything that he remembered. The strangeness of his surroundings oppressed him, and he often asked his sister if it were his own fancy, or if the undergraduates of the rising generation did not appear to her singularly young and childish in their tastes. Miss Mozley herself, who had the warmest affection for her brother, and who understood better, perhaps, than anyone else all the splendour of his intellect, was naturally anxious that his merits should be recognized, and that he should himself do full justice to his own powers. 'As an elder sister,' writes the present Bishop of Salisbury, 'she had not only a most unselfish love for him, and an abundant and discriminating admiration of his powers and writings, but a tender solicitude that he should shine and be appreciated under these new conditions.' But his wife's death in 1872 was a shock from which he never recovered. Three years later he had a slight attack of paralysis, and in the spring of 1876 he left Oxford, in the hope that change of air and scene might restore his strength. During this enforced period of inactivity his lectures were delivered by Mr. Wordsworth, whose valuable services were placed at Dr. Mozley's disposal with the greatest readiness and affection. At the same time, Miss Mozley herself undertook the task of revising and editing her brother's work. 'Her part,' writes the Bishop of Salisbury, 'was to bring before the world that remarkable series of writings which were to many a revelation (alas! all too tardy), of the existence in their midst of a brilliant intellect of the first order on the side of faith.' The task with her was a labour of love, and could hardly have been accomplished without her previous experience in this line.

First of all came the famous volume of *University Sermons*. His sisters had long been anxious that these sermons should be published, and when, in the spring of 1875, Anne Mozley paid her brother a visit at Christ Church her sister Fanny wrote to her, 'If you can persuade James to publish his sermons you will have done a good work in going to Oxford.' As might be expected, she lost no opportunity of urging the point upon him, and although at the time Dr. Mozley still shrank from the effort, her representations were not thrown away. Immediately after his seizure in the following November, he resolved to delay the publication no longer, and wrote to Messrs. Rivington on the subject, saying that his sister would carry on the necessary correspondence. The book appeared in May 1876, and by July not a single copy of the first edition remained to be had.



Seldom indeed has a single volume of sermons gained such instantaneous and complete hold of the public mind. The press was unanimous in its verdict of praise and in the homage which it paid to the author's powers. Mr. Gladstone, who had given Dr. Mozley the first piece of patronage at his disposal in 1869—a canonry at Worcester—and had afterwards recommended him for the post of Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, sent the volume to a friend with the remark that no such sermons had appeared since those of Newman. The warmth of his praise found an echo in many hearts, and another old friend, Lord Blachford, wrote that the sermons seemed to him to combine the dry wit of Bishop Butler and the rich expansion of Newman with the searching judgment of both. It is less generally known that the titles of these sermons, as well as those of the later series of *Parochial Sermons*, were chosen by Miss Mozley. Such forcible and expressive titles as 'The Reversal of Human Judgment,' 'Our Duty to Equals,' 'The Unspoken Judgment of Mankind,' 'The Relief of Utterance,' 'The Teaching of Events,' 'The Strength of Wishes,' 'The Secret Justice of Temporal Providence,' 'Life a Probation,' are happy instances of her powers of discernment and selection.

This volume was followed in 1877 by another entitled *Ruling Ideas in Early Ages*, being a course of lectures on the moral difficulties of the Old Testament, delivered to a class of Oxford graduates. Dr. Mozley himself took deep interest in these lectures, which he often told his sister had been a source of the greatest pleasure and benefit to himself, and spoke with strong regard of the members who had attended them, many of whom now occupy high positions in the Church.

Meanwhile Dr. Mozley's strength was rapidly failing. On November 22, 1877, he wrote his last letter to his sister, beginning with the words, 'I beg to congratulate you on a new edition of *Ruling Ideas*.' A few weeks later came a final seizure, which ended his life on the 4th of January, 1878.

But his death was not allowed to interrupt the publication of his works. His sister persevered bravely in her task, and with the help of Mr. Wordsworth, whose warm regard for her brother, and just appreciation of his powers, had from the first won her confidence, the two volumes of *Essays Historical and Theological* were now given to the world. These brilliant reviews, which had been originally contributed to the *British Critic* and *Christian Remembrancer*, appeared before the close of the year with a graceful dedication to Mr. Wordsworth, 'the valued friend of later years, whose name the author

would have gladly seen thus connected with his own,' and an introductory sketch from the editor's own pen.

'The introduction to the Essays,' writes Bishop Wordsworth, 'is a charming sketch of her brother's life . . . which has always seemed to me to be one of the most beautiful pieces of work of this kind with which I am acquainted. It is admirable for its truth and discrimination, as well as for its delicate touch and warmth of reserved affection. The skill of the trained artist and analyst of character is made at once more direct in its strokes and more fine in its delineations by the recollections of a life-long love' (p. xix).

Another article from the *Christian Remembrancer*, on Dr. Newman's *Essay on Development*, was afterwards republished in a separate form by Miss Mozley at the request of some Oxford friends who were anxious to counteract the influence exercised by Newman's argument in drawing young men to Rome. Next came, in 1879, the *Sermons Parochial and Occasional*, and another volume of *Lectures and other Theological Papers*, consisting chiefly of the lectures delivered in the Latin Chapel, and in the compilation of which the Bishop of Salisbury had a large share. Finally, in the year 1884, came the last of the series, the volume of *Letters*, which surprised many even of the friends who had known Dr. Mozley intimately by their liveliness and spirit, by the vivid way in which contemporary events are described and the keen interest they reveal in the small incidents of domestic life, 'concerns of the particular hearth and home.' In acknowledging the copy of this work which Miss Mozley had sent him, Cardinal Newman wrote, 'James would have reason to say with Queen Katharine, "After my death I wish no other herald but such an honest chronicler as Griffith," and that because you have let him speak for himself.' The book, in fact, answered in its form and plan to his idea of a biography. Many years before he had expressed his feelings on this point in a letter to his sister, Mrs. John Mozley.

'It has ever been a hobby of mine, though perhaps it is a truism, not a hobby, that the true life of a man is in his letters . . . Not only for the interest of a biography, but for arriving at the inside of things, the publication of letters is the true method. Biographers varnish; they assign motives, they conjecture feelings, they interpret Lord Burleigh's nods; but contemporary letters are facts.'

The admirable manner in which Miss Mozley had fulfilled the task of editing her brother's letters no doubt influenced the Cardinal himself in his choice of an editor for his own correspondence. In the same letter (November 20, 1884), in

which he thanks her for her brother's *Letters*, he asks her to undertake the task of illustrating his brief memoir of his life up to 1833, with letters of his own, and of his family and friends belonging to this period. The commission was wholly unexpected, and at first Miss Mozley shrank with natural diffidence from undertaking so great and important a work. 'Such a task,' she says herself—'the task of placing one of the foremost men of his day before the world—was too strange and undreamt of to be understood.' But she was soon made to realize that, owing to her relationship with Cardinal Newman's sister, and the intimate knowledge of those bygone days, there was no one else living who had access to the family records and could do the work with the same freedom and accuracy. Accordingly she yielded to his wish, and in February 1885 the task was finally committed to her with the words, 'I wish you to keep steadily in mind, and when you publish to make it known, that I am cognisant of no part of your work.' And in a letter written a month later Cardinal Newman quotes Miss Mozley's own words as accepting the rule then laid down for her guidance—'your own letters to be brought into use, with every document you send me, all to be as true and simple as I can make it.'

For the remainder of Anne Mozley's life, the work of editing Cardinal Newman's letters from early youth until the day when he left the English Church, became her great and abiding interest. She made her selection from the vast store of materials placed in her hands towards the close of 1884, and returned the papers to Cardinal Newman in the summer of 1887, after which other collections of letters from different friends were placed at her disposal, and much had to be added. But troubles and difficulties, loss of friends and relatives, came in the way of pursuing her task first, and then a fall and badly broken arm, then a still heavier calamity, partial loss of sight, which led to almost total blindness during the last two years of her life. This last misfortune compelled her to give up her country home at Barrow and return to Derby, where her younger sisters were living. The change had become imperative, for she soon became absolutely dependent on others. But in spite of all these difficulties, in spite of blindness and sorrows, she persevered loyally with her sacred task, and was able to place the volumes before the public a few months after the great Cardinal's death, in obedience to his original intention and lately expressed wish.

These invaluable letters having already been the subject of an article in this *Review*, we have only now to add that

all through Miss Mozley makes us feel the holiness and beauty of character in which the true secret of Newman's influence lay, and share the certainty of her conviction that under all changes of thought and circumstances his truth, sincerity, and disinterestedness were absolutely unaltered. The book, indeed, is, to quote the Bishop of Salisbury's words—

'a wonderful one ; wonderful for its sympathy and fidelity, wonderful for its reserve and unreserve ; wonderful for its grasp of detail and its breadth of good sense. English Churchmen have to thank Miss Mozley for many things, but this last gift is, perhaps, the greatest, for it enables them to understand, to sympathize with and admire the character of Newman, and yet to perceive its inherent weakness and its grave defects. These volumes are so transparently fair, and based upon such full materials, that the judgment deduced from them must be final' (p. xx).

The literary powers displayed by Miss Mozley in her editorial capacity, and especially in this her last and greatest work, would have been sufficient to arouse the interest of English Churchmen in this volume of her original writings which has now been published.

But these *Essays* are so eminently suggestive and readable, so full of wit and humour and wisdom, that they have already found their way into a wider circle, and have been cordially welcomed by the general public. Critics of the most varied kind have been unanimous in their praise, and have hastened to do justice to their high literary excellence.

The present volume contains eight separate essays, originally contributed to *Blackwood*, and one still more remarkable which appeared in the autumn of 1859, in the short-lived magazine known as *Bentley's Quarterly*. This was the review on *Adam Bede*, which was pronounced by George Eliot to be the best notice of her book that she had seen. Miss Mozley's quick sympathy had at once recognized the genius of this new and unknown writer, whose voice appealed so powerfully to the men and women of the day. At a time when George Eliot's personality was a mystery to all, her unerring glance rightly divined the secret of her sex, and she gives a whole string of reasons in support of her conclusions. Her judgments were equally accurate on the character and point of view of the author and the evident familiarity with middle-class homes which alone could produce such faultless studies of country life. Her appreciation of this side of the picture is as keen as might be expected from one who was herself so familiar with Derbyshire country folk, while her analysis of

the different characters of Mrs. Poyser and Mr. Irwine is a masterpiece in its way.

'We do not know whether our literature anywhere possesses such a closely true picture of purely rural life as *Adam Bede* presents. Every class that makes up a village community has its representative, and not only is the dialect of the locality accurately given, but the distinct inflection of each order. The field labourer's rude utterance, "as incapable of an undertone as a cow or a stag," receives a touch of cultivation when it is used by the mechanic; and these two again are varied in the farm house, while each individual has appropriate peculiarities which give a distinct truth of portraiture. . . . And well does the midland county dialect come out in this its first appearance, as far as we know, as a written language. How faithfully it expresses pathos, common sense, and humour! On Adam's lips how forcible, on Mrs. Poyser's tongue how pungent, in old Lisbeth how querulous! . . . With what truth and humour is the harvest supper described, with how strong a sympathy for the occasion! Hot roast beef we are made to feel as sublime a thing as these men must feel it, who every day in the year except Sunday eat their dinner cold under a hedge. And the silence! the real business of the occasion, too serious for a divided attention "even if these farm labourers had anything to say, which they had not." The harvest song and the thumping, and the subsequent slow unthawing under the influence of the ale! . . . The whole picture is real in every detail, and in its place inappreciable, relieving the reader after the too painful scenes which precede it. There is a dance too in another part of the story with which we sympathise; of course a country dance, so dear to memory—"a glorious country dance, best of all dances"; the dance bewailed in many a tender elegy, which, if the pen of genius could be allowed a voice, would again be in the ascendant. . . . But all the author's humour centres in Mrs. Poyser, a new development of an old type. Mrs. Poyser never tries to amuse; she is the veriest utilitarian in her profession, and takes too business-like a view of life for smiles in her own person, or for any sanction of them in others. We almost apologise to her for finding mere diversion in so much cool, caustic good sense. Indeed, her power lies in denuding everything of adventitious distinction, of its merely ornamental character, and reducing it to its first principles. Hetty's beauty is a constant mark for her analysis: "she is no better nor a cherry wi' a hard stone inside." . . . Whatever is not useful is worthless in her eyes, as she objects to lap-dogs because they are good neither for "butcher's meat nor barking." She is perpetually tracing things to their causes—to that *inside* which no fair exterior can divert from her thoughts. No dignity can live through the licence of her tongue; some apt but derogatory comparison will surely drag it through the mire. She is more than equal, she is mistress of every occasion, superior to every antagonist; her tongue is always trenchant, inexorable, always conqueror. . . . Herself a pattern of stability, subversion of natural order is her type of weak-

ness. "The right end up'ard" is strength and prosperity; a foolish wife is "your head in a bog, and when it is there your heels in the shape of unprofitable shorthorns may as well go after it." And the excuse of bad managers who say the weather's in fault is dismissed with, "as there's folks 'ud stand on their heads and then say the fault is in their boots" (pp. 333-9).

Miss Mozley's remarks on Mr. Irwine will strike the modern reader as even more interesting. All her deep sympathy with the revival of the Oxford Movement does not in the least diminish her genuine delight in this cleric of the old school.

'It is well to reclaim from the past such a portrait as Mr. Irwine's. His faults are not the faults of our day; his merits are worth study, if it will teach how he knit himself into the affections of his flock. The portrait altogether charms by its harmony: whether we ought or not, we pity these simple people when the change of dynasty comes, and they exchanged all he had for what he was supposed to want—the difference so aptly summed up by Mrs. Poyser: "Mr. Irwine was like a good meal o' victual; you were the better for him without thinking on it. Mr. Ryde was like a dose o' physic; he griped you and worried you, and after all he left you much the same." There is the frank admission of failure in some essentials, but what he did teach went home. His presence inspired confidence, and was a kind of teaching. "It is summut like," says Mrs. Poyser, "to see such a man as that i' the desk on Sunday! as I say to Poyser, it is like looking at a full crop o' wheat, or a pasture with a fine dairy o' cows in it." Or, as old Bartle Massey expresses it, "Ay, ay, he's good metal; he gives the right ring when you try him, our parson does." It is not amiss in the self-complacency of the present age to have what we feel is a true portrait from the old "dead" time reversing some of our ideas. Perhaps it is hardly fair to dwell too much on that other distinction: that if his doctrine was not as high as other people's, yet "he acted pretty much up to what he said; he didn't set up for being so different from other folks one day, and then be as like 'em as two peas the next," because, of course, the higher the standard the more risk there is of falling off; but this is one of the hits on clerical matters which we have noticed, as well as the further one on the prevailing ignorance of common things in merely professional clergy, contrasted with Mr. Irwine's quickness and general knowledge: "I've always mistrusted that sort o' learning as leaves folks foolish and unreasonable about business," though no doubt this ignorance does imply want of sympathy and an undue selfish absorption in our own particular pursuits" (p. 332).

It is not often that a review written more than thirty years ago can afford us so rare an intellectual treat, but then it does not often happen that both the book reviewed and the critique itself are of the very first order of literary excellence.

M  
that  
herit  
But  
and  
Ano  
the  
litera  
can  
gifts  
Moz  
day,  
taugh  
Les  
genui  
of sty  
ideas  
simpl  
mots  
appli  
ago.  
of a g  
ledge  
woul  
life a  
being  
true  
of the  
A  
the li  
have  
the v  
figura  
image  
the ra  
mind  
metap  
of su  
and c  
memo  
capab  
was th



Much of the pleasure which these *Essays* give us is due to that charm of style that seems to have been the common heritage of every member of Miss Mozley's gifted family. But more still is owing to the delicate and refined sympathy and discriminating insight which reveals itself at every page. Another thing that strikes us is the wide range of reading, the extensive knowledge of English, French, and Italian literature which their author possessed. Nothing, for instance, can be better than the essay on La Bruyère, a moralist whose gifts of kindly satire and knowledge of human nature Miss Mozley herself shared in no small degree. In the present day, we fancy, there are few of our high-school- and college-taught maidens to whom the wit and wisdom of the author of *Les Caractères* is equally familiar. Yet La Bruyère was a genuine artist, who sought after and attained that perfection of style which he felt necessary for the right expression of his ideas, and who employed all his art to set forth the beauty of simplicity, goodness, and independence. Many of his *bons mots* are frequently quoted by living writers, and are as applicable to society now as they were two hundred years ago. He likens the growth of large fortunes to the cooking of a great dinner: the results may be exquisite, but a knowledge of the hands employed and the materials made use of would fill us with loathing! And he it was who first said of life at court, 'It does not make us happy, but it prevents our being happy anywhere else,' a saying which is probably as true of life in London society at the present moment as it was of the court of Versailles in the days of the Grand Monarque.

Again, no one who was not intimately acquainted with the literature of England during the last two centuries could have written the essay on 'Illustration.' Miss Mozley uses the word in its widest meaning, as including the whole figurative machinery of imagination — metaphor, simile, imagery—and points out how in all these forms it enlarges the range of human fancy and trains men to see through the mind as well as through the eye. Our common talk is full of metaphor; the sights and sounds of our daily life, the imagery of sunrise and sunset, of the lily and the rose, of storm and cloud, have been the property of the poet from time immemorial. But hackneyed as these subjects are, they are yet capable of sudden illumination in the poet's hand. Shakspeare was the first to affix the idea of sovereignty to the morning:

'Full many a glorious morning have I seen  
Flatter the mountain-tops with sovran eye.'

Wordsworth first endowed it with innocence :

'The innocent brightness of a new-born day  
Is lovely yet.'

And often as the dawn comes round no one called it confident  
before Browning in his 'Lost Leader.'

'Life's night begins ; let him never come back to us :  
There would be doubt, hesitation, and pain,  
Forced praise on our part, the glimmer of twilight,  
Never glad confident morning again.'

'Every true poet, in fact, adds something to the common stock of imagery, and so enlarges our perception' (p. 92). But the flash of genius lends freshness to the most common analogies, as, for instance, when Othello exclaims on the eve of strangling Desdemona, 'Put out the light, and then put out the light !' or when George Eliot likens Hetty's beauty to the rose. 'If ever a girl was made of roses it was Hetty that Sunday morning.'

Again, metaphor is the natural link between man and the world he lives in. Miss Mozley points out how Wordsworth is the poet of all others who has converted nature to his uses, and made every natural object eloquent with new meaning.

'To every natural form, rock, fruit, or flower,  
E'en the loose stones that cover the highway,  
I gave a moral life.'

And of all departments of nature the commonest field of illustration is supplied by the animal kingdom. Everyone can call his neighbour an ass, or liken a singer to the nightingale. Dr. Johnson died with this form of metaphor on his lips. He complained of the man who sat up with him in his last illness : 'Instead of watching he sleeps like a dormouse, and when he helps me to bed he is as awkward as a turnspit dog the first time he is put into the wheel.' The most prosaic writers make a lively use of animals for this purpose. Mr. Trollope, for instance, in his novels compares his characters by turns to wolves, birds of prey, decoy ducks, magpies, &c., and the Hon. Mrs. Jameson's powdered footman in *Cranford*, the terror of all the good ladies who could not boast such a distinction, 'in his pleasantest and most gracious mood, looked like a sulky cockatoo' (p. 84).

Three qualities Miss Mozley lays down as essential to a perfect illustration. It must be apt, it must be original, and it must be characteristic of its author. But every age has its

peculiar line, and every man or woman of genius uses illustration after his own manner and to his own taste.

Another essay on a very different subject is called 'Hymns of the Populace.' Under this title the writer introduces us to a large variety of popular hymns, including the compositions of the converted collier Richard Weaver, of Moody and Sankey, and other revivalist and teetotaler hymn-writers. Miss Mozley dwells on the great interest of these collections quite apart from their poetical merits, as throwing light upon classes of people concerning whose real thoughts and feelings we know very little. There can be no doubt that a religious revival, however mischievous in other ways, does bring to light the habits and feelings of the populace in a remarkable degree, and these hymns, with their strange irreverence, their noisy choruses, and ludicrous rhymes, may well deserve study as a useful and important means of revelation. And fortunately, in all these compilations there are a few really good and fine hymns, which will hold their own in popular favour as long as the English language is spoken. If the reformed drunkard or prize-fighter can in his moments of penitence be brought thoroughly to understand the meaning of these, we agree with Miss Mozley that, in default of something better, a good work will have been done.

The seventh essay, 'Poets at Play,' is a delightful collection of witty rhymes, impromptu verses, and *jeux d'esprit*, tossed off by great poets and writers on the spur of the moment. These little spurts of the muse, Miss Mozley justly contends, have an especial value as examples of that exceptional life and vivacity which is an essential element of the poet's nature. No one writes verses in the dumps, though the recollection of despondent moods is made excellent capital of by the poet when the cloud is blown over. Trifles such as these are tokens of that eternal youthfulness which never leaves the poet as long as he can write a line. They are pleasant instances of the versatility of genius, and often add an engaging touch of homeliness to the names of our greatest singers.

'Whatever a man of genius writes because it pleases him to write it will tell us something of himself, though it be but a direction to his printer, an invitation to dinner, or a recipe for the cook' (p. 223). Sir Walter Scott's lines to James Ballantyne, for instance, tell us a great deal about his own feelings and character, his momentary discouragement under difficulty, his rejoicing over finished work, and unflinching

resolution to carry on the task he had set before him. This is how he exults over the completion of *Rob Roy* :—

'With great joy I send you *Roy* ;  
'Tis a tough job, but we've done with *Rob*.'

And when he can at last escape to the country after a long spell of work he thus addresses his landlady in rhyme :—

'So good-bye, Mrs. Brown ;  
I am going out of town,  
Over dale, over down,  
Where bugs bite not,  
Where lodgers fight not,  
Where below you chairmen drink not,  
Where beside you gutters stink not,  
But all is fresh and clear and gay,  
And merry lambkins sport and play.'

Cowper's letters in rhyme display a vivacity which we should hardly have expected from this melancholy poet, and his 'History of a Walk in the Mud' is one of the most charming dialogues in verse that was ever written. Then we have Gay's famous recipe for stewed veal, addressed to Swift, and ending with the lines—

'Put this pot of Wood's metal  
In a hot boiling kettle,  
And there let it be  
(Mark the doctrine I teach)  
About—let me see—  
Thrice as long as you preach.  
So, skimming the fat off,  
Say grace with your hat off.  
Oh, then with what rapture  
Will it fill Dean and Chapter !'

Byron's apostrophe to his publisher, 'My Murray ;' Dr. Johnson's witty lines to Mrs. Thrale on her birthday—

'Oft in danger, yet alive,  
We are come to thirty-five ;'

and Canning's memorable despatch to the English minister at the Hague are among the curiosities of literature that find a place in these pages. This last was actually sent in cipher to Sir Charles Bagot at the end of a prolonged negotiation on commercial reciprocity, in which the proposals made by M. Falck, the Dutch minister, were too one-sided to be accepted. Sir Charles was one day at court, when a brief but urgent despatch from the Secretary of State for Foreign

189

Aff  
bef  
dec

the  
wea  
he c

'  
sigh  
yout  
fact  
whic  
ferr  
taste

I  
subj  
alrea  
essay  
as k  
hims  
hum  
good  
One  
temp  
there  
temp  
thing  
Miss  
temp  
has b  
plagu  
temp  
neigh  
have  
Miss  
respe

Affairs was put into his hand, and after an interval of delay before the key could be obtained, to his intense amazement he deciphered the following words :—

'In matters of commerce the fault of the Dutch  
Is giving too little and asking too much ;  
With equal advantage the French are content,  
So we'll clap on Dutch bottoms a twenty per cent.,

Twenty per cent.,

Twenty per cent. ;

Nous frapperons Falck with twenty per cent.

'GEORGE CANNING.'

Canning, it may be observed, is here allowed to rank with the poets by virtue of his famous song of 'The Pilot that weathered the Storm' and his verses in the *Anti-Jacobin*, and he certainly deserves to be called a universal genius.

'The poet,' adds Miss Mozley, 'we need not say, is for ever sighing over the youth that is past and gone, not taking note of the youth that remains to him, altogether independent of years. But in fact he is a boy all his life, capable of finding amusement in matters which the plodding man of the world considers puerile, and so conferring on his readers and lovers some share of his own spring, some taste of the freshness which helps to keep the world alive' (p. 260).

Four out of the nine essays in this volume treat of social subjects. Here, as in the *Saturday Review* essays we have already mentioned, Miss Mozley is at her best. A born essayist, she detects the faults and failings of mankind with as keen an eye and as native a gift of satire as La Bruyère himself, but never loses sight of the deeper and nobler side of human nature. Her remarks are never wanting in truth and good sense. They are always clever and always kindly. One of her most amusing chapters is devoted to the study of temper. Thackeray, we all know, was fond of saying that there is no advantage equal to that of a thoroughly bad temper, since people are sure to let its owner enjoy everything of the best rather than run the risk of opposing him. Miss Mozley so far agrees with him, as to say that a bad temper does often seem favourable to health. The man who has been a Turk all his life, survives all those whom he has plagued ; but, on the other hand, many a rich man's bad temper preaches a constant sermon of content to his poorer neighbours. They would rather go without his money than have his sour spirit of discontent. On the whole we think Miss Mozley is decidedly indulgent towards sinners in this respect. She thinks there is so much to provoke us all in

the topsy-turvy course of this world's affairs, that temper should rather invite than repel our sympathy. Nobody is liked the worse for giving way to occasional bursts of temper, and some forms of temper are positively attractive. Women especially tolerate ill-temper in the men who are near and dear to them with marvellous patience and a firm belief in their own powers of subduing it.

The writer goes on to analyse the different varieties of temper from an artistic point of view. She distinguishes between the aggressive temper and the bad one, the petulant temper and the grumbling one, the violent temper and the sullen one, the melancholy carping temper and the sprightly carping temper, which is every bit as irritating in its way. But all these forms of temper alike give pain to others, and the person whose frequent mood it is to give pain, the writer wisely remarks, separates himself from our sympathies by a gap not easily bridged over. Miss Mozley thinks that on the whole women have improved in the control of their tempers since the days of Addison and the *Spectator*. In those times the sight of a woman of rank and fashion in a violent rage seems to have been a common occurrence in society. At least ladies no longer throw scalding tea-kettles at their visitors' heads, or fly at their husbands' periwigs. Neither would the servants of the present age put up with kicks and *coups de bâton*, or take halfcrowns in atonement for cuffs and blows from their master or mistress. But too many homes are darkened and too many lives are still made miserable by ill-temper to treat the subject lightly, and Miss Mozley ends seriously enough.

'Do quarrels gather round us? Are we "fruitful hot water," living in a commotion? Are people *solicitous* to please us, as though it were not an easy matter to do so—vigilant to see how we take things, forward with apologies, anxious in civilities? Are we bent on giving pleasure *our* way, and vexed when people prefer their own? Do we lose our friends by an exceptional inconstancy on their part? Have we a large stock of grievances? Do we find a great many people irritable, unreasonable, disagreeable, and consider it due to ourselves to let them know our opinion? If conscience gives an affirmative answer, then we may be sure we have a temper that would come under some other denomination than sweet, or good, or even well-regulated—a temper to be mended, a task to take in hand' (p. 218).

In another essay, under the polite phrase of 'Social Hyperbole,' the author enters her protest against the modern use of slang as destructive of all good talk. There is, she observes, in the youth of the present day a general disposition to reduce



all definition to two or three terms. All that affects the boy pleasantly is jolly, all that bores the girl is horrid, all they find tiresome is awful, while a compound of the two is employed to signify every degree of satisfaction, and the boy or girl who desires to express the climax of contentment can find no better phrase than that of 'awfully jolly.' Now a great deal of this economy of language, Miss Mozley observes, is due to mental laziness. A word that will do for all occasions, and 'like the bark of a dog depends for its meaning upon intonation,' certainly saves trouble, and from soft and ruddy lips may pass for the 'sweet audacity of youth.' But when the first charm of early youth is past, when these airy talkers reach the age of thirty, what are they to do? They have for so many years restricted their vocabulary to two or three adverbs and adjectives that they have forgotten how to use fitting epithets, and are forced to retire into social obscurity. There can be no doubt that a time does come to all of us when 'jolly' and 'horrid' and 'awful' cease to be graceful. The English as a nation have never been distinguished for good talking. Madame de Staël once said that the English *could* talk well, but that since the art of conversation did not advance their fortunes they took no trouble about it. The failing, we fear, is, as Miss Mozley remarks, a growing one. Few people nowadays care to listen to good talk, and ordinary English conversation is curiously wanting in finish and accuracy. Yet accurate talking leads to accurate thinking, just as clear thought leads to clear speaking. 'Practice in words clears up ideas' (p. 5).

Miss Mozley expands her views on this subject, and on the larger field of young people's training, more fully in the admirable essay entitled 'Schools of Mind and Manners,' a chapter which every parent of the present day ought to read attentively. As might be expected, she complains of the lack of discipline and bad manners in the children of the period, and defends the old system under which training in manners was considered even more important than actual book learning. In her eyes good manners are something more than a mere adornment. With the sweetest singer of the age she holds that 'manners are not idle, but the fruit of noble mind.' Yet in these days, when so much attention is paid to intellectual development, this part of education is strangely neglected.

'While so great a point is made of thoroughness in all other learning, the mere A B C grounding of manners threatens to be left untaught. It seems supposed that, given so much intellectual culture, boys and girls, by the mere process of growing old, turn into polite, considerate men and women. We do not believe it. Many arts and

sciences are more easily acquired late in life than a good manner. If people are to behave well they must be early taught to behave—a practice that demands unceasing sacrifices of minute personal liking to the general pleasure and convenience' (p. 303).

Miss Mozley dwells especially on the importance of teaching children to listen. Children who are perpetually chattering to one another never acquire the habit of intelligent listening, and lose a great deal which they might easily acquire by the exercise of this faculty. The intellectual sympathy that makes men and women good companions is acquired by listening, not by talking. And it is to the neglect of early training in this respect that the decay of conversation as an art is in a great measure to be ascribed. Yet still, even in these degenerate days, Miss Mozley reflects with satisfaction, there are children who are brought up on the old system—not because it *is* a system, but *because* the mother's recollections of her own education lead her in this direction—children

'who respond with dutiful alacrity to the training of manners; who are obedient to rule, courteous, friendly, hospitable to strangers in their small, innocent way; who greet with a smile welcome company, and brighten under it; who watch their mother's eye and obey her behests, and so doing catch her grace of air and movement. These are children, whatever their literary attainments, who will grow into gentle, refining influences; who will perpetuate good traditions, and maintain the charm as well as the virtues of family life. And, moreover, whatever their store of exact knowledge, they will have a diction and facility of expression which perhaps will more than stand comparison with others deeper read, but less practised in social intercourse' (p. 281).

We admit the charm of the picture and confess that the modern child as a rule falls decidedly short of the writer's ideal. But, perhaps, if we may venture to say so, some compensation for this lack of discipline and want of attention to manners may be found in the superior thoroughness of intellectual training which our children receive, and which certainly ought to counteract in some degree the absence of strictness that marks our present system of education. But no one will dispute the truth of the writer's remarks or the need there is for parents, as well as children, to be sometimes reminded that it is, after all, in the words of the old Wykehamist motto, Manners that make the man. And the subject is one on which Miss Mozley had a good right to express an opinion, for she herself was a model of good breeding, and combined the most winning and graceful courtesy with the highest intellectual culture and literary attainments. She

was in  
wom  
O  
is 'T  
lantly  
period  
ownin  
of a s  
mezzo  
of ou  
fifty.  
and fi  
the ga  
very i  
than  
fading  
answe  
Here  
labour  
pleasu  
in La  
deserv  
and ap  
menta  
aping  
middle  
looks,  
things  
true w  
sures  
each i  
whole.  
and sp  
statesm  
He loo  
youth  
adds i  
young  
(p. 148)  
Th  
long a  
an old  
own s  
times  
her int

was indeed a perfect type of the refined and cultivated gentlewoman of a generation that is fast passing away.

One more essay that strikes us as very pleasant reading is 'The Four Ages.' Here the writer takes up her pen gallantly, in defence of that comparatively dull and uninteresting period of life generally known as middle age. While freely owning the fascination of childhood and youth, and the beauty of a serene old age, she writes brightly and vigorously of that *mezzo del cammin della vita* which after all marks the moment of our mental prime—forty or forty-five; with some it is fifty. These middle decades of life, she argues, between forty and fifty, or even sixty, are a capital working time; for then the gains of thought and experience, and in most cases that very important factor in human life liberty of action, more than compensate for the loss of youthful ardour and the fading of our early dreams. This is our period of maturity, answering to the summer and autumn of the natural world. Here we have the time of performance, the week-days of labour wherein the true work of the world is done. If the pleasures and advantages of middle life—that *âge viril* which, in La Bruyère's words, we do not esteem as highly as it deserves—were acknowledged as openly as they are enjoyed and appreciated in reality, there would be less of the sentimental regret for the springtime of life, less of that 'foolish aping of youth' which is now so often to be seen among middle-aged persons. But the truth is, 'most people go by looks,' and that part of life when we were comeliest and all things became us retains its fascination for the memory. The true wisdom, she concludes, is neither to anticipate the pleasures or duties of each stage, but to enjoy and profit by each in turn, when it comes, and so make life one harmonious whole. In all classes of life active industry keeps off the sense and spread of approaching old age. The busy man, whether statesman or shopkeeper, has his mind still fixed on the future. He looks forward and so retains the habits and sensations of youth when the fact is long past. But nothing, the writer adds in conclusion, 'cheers the whole prospect of life to the young like a picture of calm, bright, intelligent old age' (p. 148).

The words remind us of some others that were spoken not long ago of Miss Mozley herself: 'We never thought of her as an old lady. She never suffered that contraction into her own self, that indifference to the outer world which sometimes marks old age.' To the end of her life she never lost her interest in everything that was happening around her, and

to the last she kept her youthful spirits and keen capacity for enjoyment.

The Bishop of Salisbury, who was closely associated with Miss Mozley in the publication of her brother's works, and could speak from experience of her literary qualities, tells us that to these she owed much of the freshness and charm of her old age. 'They assured for her a perpetual youth; they environed her with an atmosphere of grace and dignity; they invested her with a right to direct and command, through the possession of an almost manly vigour, and a right to receive willing homage by virtue of her feminine sweetness and refinement' (p. xx). During the last months of her life she became almost entirely blind, but in her darkened state she was still the centre of interest and conversation, still the same attentive listener and keen critic that she had always been. Her delight in the company of young people never failed. In her last days she was never happier than when surrounded by the children of the family, the great-nephews and nieces in whose hearts Aunt Anne will long remain a cherished memory. Even the sense of dependence upon others, trying as it must have been to one of her character, did not disturb the serenity of her nature. Strangers who saw her for the first time called her the sweetest old lady they had ever met. She did not long survive the publication of Cardinal Newman's *Letters*, and only lived long enough to witness the warm praise with which her great work was received by those whose opinion she most valued. Her task was done, and when the call came she was ready to go. She had always had the blessing of good health, and she was spared suffering at the last. A sudden cold brought on an attack of short but sharp illness, under which she sank rapidly, and on June 27, 1891, she passed quietly away. A few days afterwards she was buried at Barrow, where many of the happiest and most fruitful days of her life had been spent, and where her name is still fondly remembered. The poor flocked to her funeral, and surprise was expressed at the presence of one old woman who had been her Sunday scholar long ago. 'I couldn't do no otherwise,' was the answer that came from a full heart. Many who had known Anne Mozley share the feeling that prompted these words.

We are grateful to her for her life and for her work, for her large sympathies and her unshaken faith, for the loyalty with which she held fast to the Church of her fathers, for the talents that she devoted to its service. Above all we thank her for the great traditions which she has preserved of the movement and of the men to whom we owe so much.

A  
A D  
v  
r  
f  
(

THE  
adver  
has a  
congr  
pletic  
mere  
of th  
say I  
thous  
labour  
inten  
fallen  
which  
articl  
other  
the I  
consi  
suppl  
is by  
taking  
varie  
field  
that  
to av  
such  
And,  
to gi  
cheer  
so sa  
Mr. J  
gener  
collec  
tainin

## ART. VIII.—DICTIONARY OF HYMNOLOGY.

*A Dictionary of Hymnology*: setting forth the Origin and History of Christian Hymns of all Ages and Nations, with special reference to those contained in the Hymn-Books of English-speaking Countries and now in common use; together with Biographical and Critical Notices of their Authors and Translators, &c. &c. &c. Edited by JOHN JULIAN, M.A., Vicar of Wincobank, Sheffield. (London, 1892.)

THE *Dictionary of Hymnology* has for some years past been advertised by Mr. Murray as 'forthcoming,' and now that it has actually come we must begin our notice of it by warmly congratulating its editor, the Rev. John Julian, on the completion of his labours. It would have been no slight task merely to superintend the compilation of a work on the scale of this volume, in which notice is taken of we are afraid to say how many out of the whole number of four hundred thousand hymns which are said to exist; but Mr. Julian's labours have been by no means confined to the work of superintendence. In the matter of authorship the lion's share has fallen to him throughout, and there is scarcely a page on which his initials fail to appear at the close of one or more articles. He has indeed been assisted by some thirty-five other contributors, but none of these, with the exception of the Rev. J. Mearns, the assistant editor, have furnished any considerable number of articles, while some appear to have supplied but one or two apiece. The bulk of the work, then, is by Mr. Julian himself. Whether he was wise in undertaking so large a share is another matter. Extensive and varied as his knowledge of the subject evidently is, yet the field over which he has had to range is of such vast extent that it must have been almost impossible for him altogether to avoid mistakes and omissions. The wonder is, not that such may be detected, but that there are not more of them. And, therefore, it is only fair to both editor and assistant editor to give them ungrudging thanks for the labour they have cheerfully undertaken and perseveringly carried through to so satisfactory a termination. It should also be stated that Mr. Julian is laying the Church under a further obligation by generously depositing in the Church House the valuable collection of manuscripts of which he has succeeded in obtaining possession during the preparation of the *Dictionary*.

Nor would it be right to omit a grateful recognition of the fact that the veteran publisher, Mr. John Murray—who was called to his rest only a few weeks after the appearance of this volume—was willing to undertake the production of a work the demand for which must, we fear, from the nature of the case, ever prove to be a limited one. The printing and general appearance of the work are worthy of the illustrious publishing house from whose press it is issued.

But it is time for us to give our readers a more detailed account of the contents of the volume, that they may know what to expect from it, and then we will offer some criticisms upon it, and endeavour to supplement it in regard to some points in which we have noticed omissions.

The main part of the work, containing the *Dictionary* itself, runs to a length of over 1,300 pages, and is followed by two invaluable indices, containing respectively (1) cross-references to first lines in English, French, German, Greek, Latin, and other languages, and (2) a list of authors, translators, and editors. Much of this portion of the work was finished some years ago. It has, therefore, required supplementing and bringing up to date. This most necessary work has been effected by means of a twofold appendix, containing late articles, together with additions and corrections, followed by supplemental indices of cross-references and names of authors, &c., as before. In this way Mr. Julian has been able to embody the results of recent research, and to notice fresh publications bearing upon his subject. In more than one instance important additional matter, involving occasionally corrections of previous misstatements, will be found in these appendices, besides which the biographical notices have naturally required additions, fresh hymn-writers having appeared upon the field and death having removed others in the interval that has elapsed since the articles in the body of the *Dictionary* were written and set up in type. Thus our readers will see that the editor and his colleagues have spared no pains in their endeavour to bring the work up to date, and to render it as complete and trustworthy as possible.

The plan according to which it is arranged is this: To all the best known and more important hymns, not only in English, but also in German, Greek, and Latin, separate articles are allotted, dealing with the history of the hymn itself, its text and authorship, frequently also noting the collections in which it is to be found and the translations of it which may be current. These are all arranged alphabetically under the first lines of the hymns. In the case of hymns

which  
article  
been i  
first li  
the pa  
probab  
biograp  
form a  
notice  
more  
almost  
award  
this, th  
with h  
of the  
have (C  
Churc  
Dutch  
Plymo  
borgia  
almost  
nexion  
an arti  
ness o  
finding  
fully c  
above,  
of For  
Books  
we mu  
on suc  
tions  
Psalte  
some e  
reader  
provid  
be wit  
any id  
ance v  
further  
whole  
of an a  
We p  
chiefly  
with o



which are less familiar or of smaller importance no separate articles are given ; but it does not follow that the hymn has been ignored. The reader has but to turn to the index of first lines, and there he is almost certain to find a reference to the page on which some mention of the hymn may be found, probably under the biographical notice of its author. These biographical articles (to which we hope to return presently) form a most prominent feature of the work. Not only is a notice given of all the leading religious poets, embodying with more or less completeness the main facts of their lives, but almost everybody who has ever written a single hymn is awarded a niche in Mr. Julian's temple of fame. Besides this, there are articles on every conceivable subject connected with hymnology, and the hymnody of several nations and of the leading denominations is fully discussed. Thus we have (among others) American Hymnody, Baptist, Bohemian, Church of England, Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion, Dutch, French, German, Irvingite, Italian, Latin, Methodist, Plymouth Brethren, Roman Catholic, Scandinavian, Swedenborgian, Syriac, Unitarian, and Welsh Hymnody. Indeed, almost the only omission that we have noticed in this connexion is 'Salvation Army Hymnody,' and though no doubt an article on this subject might have added to the completeness of the volume, yet we confess to a feeling of relief at finding that it has not been considered necessary to treat fully of this matter. Then, besides the articles mentioned above, we have others dealing with Doxologies, the Hymnody of Foreign Missions, Metrical Litanies, Public School Hymn-Books, Temperance Hymnody, as well as others again, in which we must say that, for our own part, we feel a deeper interest, on such subjects as these : Breviaries, Hymnarium, translations from the Latin, Primers and Offices for the Laity, Psalters, Sequences, Troparium, &c. This enumeration of some of the principal articles will be sufficient to show our readers how varied is the repast which Mr. Julian's zeal has provided for them. It will also show how impossible it would be within the limits of a single article in a review to convey any idea of one tithe of the matters of interest and importance which are discussed in the volume before us ; while, further, it will be obvious that any attempt to criticize the whole range of subjects treated of would imply the possession of an almost encyclopædic knowledge on the part of the critic. We propose, therefore, in this notice to content ourselves chiefly with drawing attention to a class of articles dealing with one particular branch of the subject, in which we confess

to a special personal interest, and which we believe to be that which is most likely to be of general interest to readers of the *Church Quarterly Review*, viz. the articles which treat of the hymns and hymn-writers of the Early and Mediæval Church.

The biographical notices of the various authorities on mediæval hymns appear to be for the most part thoroughly well done. The criticisms on the works of Herman Daniel and of Eduard Emil Koch, though severe, are perfectly just, as anyone who has had occasion to make much use of their works can testify. But there is one omission among these articles which has surprised us considerably. There is no article on the learned Jesuit Guido Maria Dreves, who has done so much during the last few years for the study of hymnology. If biographical notices are given of Daniel, Mone, and other editors of collections of hymns, most certainly there should have been one of Dreves as well. Twelve volumes of his *Analecta Hymnica Medii Ævi* have appeared at different times, adding very considerably to our knowledge of mediæval hymns; and though we cannot say that they have been entirely overlooked by the editors of the *Dictionary*, yet far more use might have been made of them than has actually been done. On p. xii the general title of the work, *Analecta Hymnica Medii Ævi*, is given, but no one would guess from this brief note how important the collection is, and how varied are its contents. We therefore append in a foot note the titles of the several volumes,<sup>1</sup> to but very few of which have we discovered any reference in the *Dictionary*. In the article on 'Sequences' there is a notice of the Limoges Proses.

'An interesting collection of Sequences has just been published under the title of *Prosarium Lemovicense* (Leipzig, Fues's Verlag,

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. 'Cantiones Bohemicæ. Leiche, Lieder und Rufe des 13., 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts.' 1886.

Vol. ii. 'Hymnarius Moissiacensis. Das Hymnar der Abtei Moissac im 10. Jahrhundert.' 1888.

Vol. iii. 'Conradus Gemnicensis. Konrads von Haimburg und seiner Nachahmer, Alberts von Prag und Ulrichs von Wessobrunn, Reimgebete und Leselieder.' 1888.

Vols. iv., xi., xii. 'Hymni Inediti. Liturgische Hymnen des Mittelalters aus handschriftlichen Breviarien, Antiphonalien und Processionalien.' 1888, 1891, 1892.

Vol. v. 'Historiæ Rhythmicæ. Liturgische Reimofficien des Mittelalters.' 1889.

Vol. vi. 'Udalricus Wessofontanus. Ulrich Stöcklins von Rottach, Abts zu Wessobrunn, 1438-1443, Reimgebete und Leselieder.' 1889.

Vol. vii. 'Prosarium Lemovicense. Die Prosen der Abtei St. Martia zu Limoges, aus Troparien des 10., 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts.' 1889.

Vols. viii., ix., x. 'Sequentiæ Ineditæ. Liturgische Prosen des Mittelalters aus Handschriften und Wiegendrucken.' 1890, 1891.

1890).<sup>1</sup> This is edited by G. M. Dreves, as pt. vii. of his *Analecta Hymnica Medii Ævi*, and contains 265 Sequences, taken from 16 Troparies of the 10th, 11th, and 12th centuries, which formerly belonged to the Abbey of St. Martial at Limoges, and are now in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris.'

This is, however, all that is said, and we are nowhere told that very many of these 265 sequences are different from any which are contained in the lists given in the article. This is probably accounted for by the fact that the lists were compiled before the publication of the volume in question. And perhaps the same excuse may be offered for the scanty use made of the *Moissac Hymnary*. It is occasionally referred to, but in a number of instances where no notice is taken of it it would have supplied an authority for the text of the hymns earlier than any which the editors have given us; and we cannot but regret that more frequent reference has not been made to it in the appendix.

Of the other work published by Dreves, *Petri Abælardi Hymnarius Paracletensis*, it would be unfair to complain that no mention is made, as it was only published in the course of last year, and probably appeared too late for the editors to avail themselves of it, or even to give it a brief notice in the appendix. But, as it adds considerably to our knowledge, and enables us to supplement the article in the *Dictionary* on Abelard with several additional particulars, our readers will, perhaps, be glad to have some account of it. All that is told us by Mr. Julian of Abelard's hymns is this:—

'For a long time, although his poetry had been referred to both by himself and by Héloïse, little of any moment was known except the Advent hymn "Mittit ad Virginem." In 1838 Greith published in his *Spicilegium Vaticanum*, pp. 123–31, six poems which had been discovered in the Vatican. Later on ninety-seven hymns were found in the Royal Library at Brussels, and published in the complete edition of Abelard's works by Cousin, *Petri Abælardi Opp.*, Paris, 1849. In that work is one of his best known hymns, *Tuba Domini, Paule, maxima*. Trench in his *Sacr. Lat. Poetry*, 1864, gives his *Ornarunt terram germina* (one of a series of poems on the successive days' work of the Creation), from Du Méril's *Poésies Popul. Lat. du Moyen Age*, 1847, p. 444.'

It does not fall within our province to tell again the oft-told story of the ill-starred career of Abelard and Héloïse. It will be sufficient to remind our readers that after the unfortunate Héloïse had been driven out of her retreat at Argenteuil, she and her nuns found an asylum in Abelard's

<sup>1</sup> The title page gives the date 1889, the (paper) cover 1890.

deserted Abbey of the Paraclete, near Troyes. It had always been known that Abelard had prepared a Hymnarium for the use of the nuns, and to this it was pretty clear that the ninety-seven hymns contained in Cousin's edition belonged. But the collection was incomplete and no other MS. of the work was known. In 1855, however, M. Carnaudet, librarian of Chaumont (Haute-Marne), published a notice of the Breviary of Abelard, which was contained in the library of which he was in charge, and some years later it was pointed out that many of Abelard's hymns which had never been printed were to be found in it. This appears to have attracted the attention of Dreves to the MS. (which, by the way, is not an early one, only dating from the sixteenth century), and on examination he found that it actually *was* the Breviary of Abelard, and contained the collection of his hymns. Inserted among them there are a certain number of older and well-known hymns, the presence of which may be taken to show either that in some instances the familiar hymns were never supplanted by Abelard's new ones, or else that, though supplanted for a time, the nuns soon returned to them, under the feeling that the old were better. But by the help of the Brussels MS. which Cousin had used for his edition, together with this newly-discovered one at Chaumont, Dreves has been able to restore the complete Hymnarium in three books, and has thus given us, instead of ninety-seven, no fewer than 133 hymns which he thinks may fairly be ascribed to Abelard himself.<sup>1</sup> It was an audacious experiment to set to work to write a complete hymnary (almost as audacious as the attempts of Richard Baxter to provide in his *Reformed Liturgy* a substitute for the Book of Common Prayer), and it is not surprising that Abelard shrank at first from the task. There was no precedent for it, for though St. Jerome, in enumerating the writings of St. Hilary of Poitiers, mentions a *Liber Hymnorum* among them, yet it was not what the later Church technically termed the *Hymnarium*, as the recent discovery of a fragment of it at Arezzo shows us. Abelard was, however, at last persuaded by the entreaties of Héloïse, whose objections to the hymns then in use are curious, and betray a surprising lack of imagination and an incapacity to enter into the true spirit of worship. She was anxious for new ones, she said, for the following reasons: (1) the authors of many of the older ones were unknown; (2) the metre of some was unsatisfactory;

<sup>1</sup> This does not include the hymn mentioned above, 'Mittit ad Virginem,' which is not contained in the Hymnarium, and which Dreves thinks is *not* the work of Abelard.

(3) so  
hours  
the h  
e.g. v  
rump  
the l  
could  
of un

or thi

O  
to ma  
free f  
existe  
to pos  
water  
the pr  
not on  
the el  
have t  
charac  
and a  
penite  
were c  
that i  
raised  
occup  
in Ch  
suffici  
compl  
an ent  
of our  
ful dis  
from v  
we fea  
similar  
provid  
instan  
large s  
he was  
Abelard

(3) some festivals were without proper hymns ; (4) unless the hours were said at the exact time for them the statements of the hymns became inappropriate, not to say positively false ; *e.g.* with what truth could anyone sing, 'Noctem canendo rumpimus,' if Mattins was deferred until after daybreak ? (5) the language of some of the hymns was too high-flown, and could not be used by the majority of people without a sense of unreality. How few, for instance, could say with truth—

'Preces gementes fundimus,  
Dimitte quod peccavimus ;'

or this :

'Nostros his cum canticis  
Fletus benigne suscipe.'

Of course it is a question of degree. We are not prepared to maintain that all the hymns in our modern hymn-books are free from undue subjectivity, or that none of them imply the existence of emotions too deep for an ordinary congregation to possess ; but if the aspirations contained in them are to be watered down until they express with mathematical exactness the precise sentiments of the average man, there is an end, not only of all the fervour and rapture of worship, but of all the elevating and stimulating power of hymnody. We should have thought that it would have been obvious that the exalted character of the sentiments was intended to raise the hearts and affections heavenward, and that the thrilling words of penitence which the Church put into the mouths of her children were designed to deepen their repentance ; and certain it is that if much weight was given to such an objection as this raised by Héloïse, the Psalms would no longer be allowed to occupy the position which has always been assigned to them in Christian worship. However the various reasons were sufficient for Abelard, and he set to work to compose a complete set of hymns for the Church's year, and prepared an entirely new Hymnarium of his own. The editors of some of our modern hymn-books could probably tell a tale of painful disappointments experienced by them on receipt of hymns from well-known authors, which had been written to order, and we fear that poor Héloïse must have experienced a somewhat similar sensation on receipt of the Hymnary which Abelard provided for her, for certainly it supplies us with a striking instance of the impossibility of writing hymns to order on a large scale. Possibly, however, it was not only the fact that he was thus writing to order that dried up the streams of Abelard's poetic fancy. Was he haunted by the fear of

incurring the wrath of the prioress by making his new hymns as high-flown in their sentiments as the old discarded ones? We cannot say. We only know that, whatever may be the reason, some of the hymns which Dreves has now printed for the first time, as well as others contained in the Brussels MS., are about as bald and prosaic as anything that can be imagined. Here is a specimen of his sober, 'matter-of-fact' way of writing, taken from the opening verse of a hymn on St. Eustace:—

'Temptavit Satanas Job multo levius  
Quam Christi martyrem, si scriptis credimus;  
Cum rebus liberos Job quidem perdidit,  
Sed at solatium uxorem habuit.'<sup>1</sup>

And the following allusion to the well-known story given by Macrobius of the *bon mot* of Augustus on hearing of the death of Herod's son is, to say the least, a startling conclusion to a hymn for the Holy Innocents' Day to be gravely sung by a company of nuns:—

'Ad mandatum  
Regis datum  
Generale  
Nec ipsius  
Infans tutus  
Est a cæde.

'Ad Augustum  
Hoc delatum  
Risum movit,  
Et rex mitis  
De immiti  
Digne luit:

'Malum, inquit,  
Est Herodis  
Esse natum;  
Prodest magis  
Talis regis  
Esse porcum.'<sup>2</sup>

It must not be imagined from this that all the hymns are of this character. There are some really fine ones among them. Dreves especially notes those in the first book of the Hymnarium for the hours on Sunday, and that for vespers

<sup>1</sup> *Hymn. Paracl.* p. 233.

<sup>2</sup> *Hymn. Paracl.* p. 224. The allusion is to Macrobius, *Saturnaliorum* lib. II. c. iv.: 'Cum audisset [Augustus] inter pueros quos in Syria Herodes rex Judæorum intra bimatum jussit interfici filium quoque ejus occisum, ait: Melius est Herodis porcum [=ὄν] esse quam filium [ἰόν].'

on S  
begin  
Dr. N  
must  
The h  
from  
made  
the E

rests o  
not (a  
but 'I  
said th  
reading  
does n  
any re  
Sabbat  
old hy

But  
that th  
biograp  
not alv  
writers  
hymns  
concern  
well-kn  
details.  
a Life o  
the Gro  
sufficien  
claims  
to them  
tunity.  
evidenc  
sketch  
in any  
enumer

<sup>1</sup> Mo  
<sup>2</sup> See  
is deligh  
VOL.



on Saturday. The latter of these is the well-known one beginning, 'O quanta qualia sunt illa Sabbata,' the original of Dr. Neale's popular hymn, 'Oh, what the joy and the glory must be,' and we think that it is quite the finest of them all. The hymn is also given by Mone,<sup>1</sup> without Abelard's name, from a St. Gall MS., and from this Dr. Neale's translation was made. It now appears, however, that in the fifth stanza of the English the rendering—

'There dawns no Sabbath, no Sabbath is o'er :  
Those Sabbath-keepers have one ever more,'

rests on an erroneous reading. What Abelard really wrote was not (as Mone edited) 'Illic *nec* Sabbato succedit Sabbatum,' but 'Illic *ex* Sabbato succedit Sabbatum.' Possibly it will be said that it comes to much the same in the end whichever reading is adopted. It may be so, but a *succession* of Sabbaths does not (like Dr. Neale's rendering of Mone's text) suggest any reminiscence of the lines from D. Burgess's hymn on the Sabbath, which have got so queerly mixed up with the grand old hymn, 'Hierusalem, my happy home'—

'Where congregations ne'er break up,  
And Sabbaths have no end.'<sup>2</sup>

But to return to Mr. Julian's *Dictionary*. We have said that there appear to be scarcely any names omitted in the biographical notices. The notices themselves, however, are not always quite what was wanted. In the case of obscure writers whose only title to fame is the composition of a few hymns it is well that a certain amount of general information concerning their lives should be given. But in the case of well-known characters we do not want too many personal details. No one would go to a Dictionary of Hymnology for a Life of St. Hilary of Poitiers, or St. Ambrose, or St. Gregory the Great. In such cases the barest outline would have been sufficient. But what *was* wanted was a discussion of their claims to the authorship of the hymns which have been ascribed to them. Mr. Julian and his colleagues have lost an opportunity. In the articles on these and other Fathers there is no evidence whatever of any independent work or research. A sketch is given of the life of the saint, such as might be found in any biographical dictionary, and there is, perhaps, an enumeration of the hymns which have been ascribed to him,

<sup>1</sup> Mone, *Hymni Latini Medii Ævi*, i. 382.

<sup>2</sup> See the *Dictionary of Hymnology*, p. 583. The article on this hymn is delightful, and quite one of the most thorough in the whole volume.

but no attempt is made to investigate the subject. No fresh light is thrown on it, nor is there even mention of the authority on which the ascription of the hymns to their reputed author rests. Indeed, it would appear as if there was occasionally some misunderstanding between the editor and his colleagues, for promises are sometimes made in these articles of information to be given elsewhere, which (so far as we can discover) are never fulfilled. For instance, in the article on St. Hilary of Poitiers we are told that there remain

'about eight hymns, the attribution of which to him is more or less certainly correct. Daniel gives seven, four of which—"Lucis largitor splendide," "Deus Pater ingenite," "In matutinis surgimus," and "Jam meta noctis transiit"—are morning hymns; one, "Jesus refulsit omnium," for the Epiphany; one, "Jesu quadragenariæ," for Lent; and one, "Beata nobis gaudia," for Whitsuntide. Thomasius gives another as Hilary's "Hymnum dicat turba fratrum." (For fuller details see under their respective first lines.)'

In that on St. Ambrose we read as follows:—

'A large number of hymns has been attributed to his pen; Daniel gives no fewer than ninety-two called Ambrosian. Of these the great majority (including one on himself) cannot possibly be his; there is more or less doubt about the rest. The authorities on the subject are the *Benedictine ed.* of his works, the *Psalterium*, or *Hymnary*, of Cardinal Thomasius, and the *Thesaurus Hymnologicus* of Daniel. The Benedictine editors give twelve hymns as assignable to him, as follows:—

1. Æterna Christi munera.
2. Æterne rerum Conditor.
3. Consors Paterni luminis.
4. Deus Creator omnium.
5. Fit porta Christi pervia.
6. Illuminans Altissimus.
7. Jam surgit hora tertia.
8. O Lux Beata Trinitas.
9. Orabo mente Dominum.
10. Somno refectis artubus.
11. Splendor Paternæ gloriæ.
12. Veni Redemptor gentium.

*Histories of these hymns, together with details of translations in English, are given in this work, and may be found under their respective first lines.'*

We wonder, by the way, why we are not here referred to Biraghi's *Inni sinceri e Carmi di Sant' Ambrogio*. A reference to this or to the latest edition of the *Works of St. Ambrose*, by P. A. Ballerini (Milan, 1881, v. 651 sq.), would

have  
the w  
hymn  
discri  
Milan  
follow  
tentio  
italici  
prom  
spect  
disco  
was  
'Jam  
pervia  
first l  
solis  
happi  
said  
ternas  
case o  
hymn  
of wh  
'fuller  
their f  
Of the  
whate  
is tha  
we ar  
genar  
St. H  
nobis  
somet  
case o  
W  
been t  
provo  
catalo  
the ed  
been a  
the qu  
hymn  
under  
pected  
reader  
they h

have been more to the point than one to Daniel, who, as the writer of the article himself mentions, prints ninety-two hymns as 'Ambrosian,' and makes no serious endeavour to discriminate between those written by the Archbishop of Milan himself and those composed by his imitators and followers. But passing over this point, we wish to draw attention to the passages in the above extracts which we have italicized. When we first read them they seemed to us most promising, and we turned with some eagerness to the 'respective first lines.' What, then, was our surprise when we discovered that of the hymns ascribed to St. Ambrose there was no notice whatever of 'Illuminans Altissimus' or of 'Jam surgit hora tertia,' while neither 'Fit porta Christi pervia' nor 'Orabo mente Dominum' was given under the first line, but had to be hunted out under the headings 'A solis ortus cardine' and 'Bis ternas horas explicans,' to which happily the index referred us, though by an odd accident the said index omitted altogether to take any notice of 'Bis ternas horas explicans' itself. This was bad enough; but the case of St. Hilary we found to be still worse. Of the *eight* hymns mentioned in the article as being those 'the attribution of which to him is more or less certainly correct,' and of which 'fuller details' are promised, only *two* are noticed at all under their first lines—'Beata nobis gaudia' and 'Jesu quadragenariæ.' Of the remaining *six* nothing whatever is said, and no notice whatever is taken. And what makes it still more aggravating is that, when we turn to the two first lines which *are* given, we are not much wiser for our pains. Of 'Jesu quadragenariæ' all that we are told is that it 'has been ascribed to St. Hilary, but is certainly of later date,' while under 'Beata nobis gaudia' we meet with this information: 'This hymn is sometimes ascribed to St. Hilary of Poitiers, but, as in the case of others, upon insufficient evidence [*see Hilary*].'

Why, we have already been to 'see Hilary,' and have been there referred to the first line! This is as tiresome and provoking as the cross-references in a badly arranged library catalogue, and with a little more supervision on the part of the editor might surely have been obviated. It would have been an excellent thing to have had a fresh investigation of the question of St. Hilary's claims to be the father of Western hymnody, and of his authorship of the hymns which pass under his name, and the least that might have been fairly expected from the editors is that they should have given their readers some indication of the nature of the evidence on which they have been ascribed to him. Let us endeavour briefly to

supply this omission on their part. 'Lucis largitor splendide' is found at the close of the 'Epistola ad Afram,'<sup>1</sup> and if that be a genuine work of St. Hilary (as there seems no good reason for doubting) then the hymn may be unhesitatingly claimed as his as well. The Benedictine editors also print four stanzas of an evening hymn which follows the same epistle in one manuscript, but they are not at all disposed to allow that St. Hilary was really the author of it. The hymn is an alphabetical one, beginning—

'Ad coeli clara non sum dignus sidera  
Levare meos infelices oculos.'

It is given in full by Mone, who mentions its occurrence in other MSS. as anonymous,<sup>2</sup> and, in spite of Cardinal Mai's advocacy of St. Hilary's claims, it is difficult to think that it is really his work,<sup>3</sup> though it must be confessed that the discovery of a fragment of his *Liber Hymnorum* supplies an argument of some weight in favour of his authorship, for the first of the hymns contained in it is a similar alphabetical one. It opens with a stanza beginning, 'Felix propheta David,' after which the following stanzas work steadily through the letters of the alphabet, just after the fashion of 'Ad coeli clara,' &c. The hymn is complete as far as the letter T, the remaining stanzas being lost.<sup>4</sup> It is at any rate curious that a genuine alphabetical hymn of St. Hilary's should thus have been discovered, and the facts ought to be allowed some weight in determining the question of his authorship of 'Ad coeli,' though in itself it is certainly not decisive. The *Liber Hymnorum* contains fragments of two other hymns, one of which, judging from internal evidence, appears to have been written by a lady, while the other, 'Adæ cernis gloriam,' is apparently by Hilary himself. Returning now to the list as quoted from Daniel in the *Dictionary*, it must be said that for only one of the hymns besides 'Lucis largitor splendide' is there even respectable authority to connect it with St. Hilary's name. 'Hymnum dicat turba fratrum' is cited as his by Hincmar (*De non trinâ Deitate*), and still earlier the text of the hymn is given in the Bangor Antiphonary, which is apparently the only MS. known to contain it. The MS. is of

<sup>1</sup> *S. Hilarii Pictaviensis Episc. Opera Omnia*, ii. 530.

<sup>2</sup> *Hymni Latini Medii Ævi*, i. 387.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Ceillier, *Histoire des Auteurs Eccl.* iv. 55.

<sup>4</sup> *S. Hilarii Tractatus de Mysteriis et Hymni* (Romæ, 1887). The discovery of this treatise is noticed in the *Dictionary of Hymnology*, app. ii. p. 1570.

the  
in it  
de C  
belie  
favo  
to fi  
use.  
plac  
used  
righ  
pen  
incl  
larg  
Brev  
Mr.  
tion  
a lis  
mus  
from  
Tho  
omn  
Sax  
may  
foun  
Hym  
A. v  
same  
(CC  
'Jes  
as in  
with  
be s  
then  
Hila  
Thre  
certa  
Liber  
1  
2  
3  
ginal  
and 4  
Brev  
sourc  
4  
a Stu

the seventh century, written between A.D. 680 and 691,<sup>1</sup> and in it the hymn is definitely entitled 'Hymnum Sancti Hilarii de Christo.'<sup>2</sup> In the case of the remaining hymns we do not believe that any real evidence can be brought forward in favour of assigning them to St. Hilary; and it is remarkable to find how few of them seem even to have come into general use. 'Beata nobis gaudia' is the only one which finds a place in the Roman Breviary. It has been pretty generally used throughout the Western Church; but Mone is probably right in thinking that it is later than Hilary's time, and dependent on 'Jam Christus astra ascenderat,' which he is inclined (after Thomasius) to ascribe to St. Ambrose. 'Lucis largitor splendide' is not found (so far as we know) in the Breviary of any Church. It is not in any of those cited by Mr. Warren in the useful table given on p. 172 of the *Dictionary*, nor is it in any of the Hymnaries of which he gives a list on p. 547. 'Deus pater ingenite,' 'In matutinis surgimus,' and 'Jam meta noctis transiit' appear to be only known from the Mozarabic Breviary,<sup>3</sup> whence they were taken by Thomasius, and from him by Daniel. For 'Jesu refulsit omnium,' the style suggested to Mone<sup>4</sup> an Irish or Anglo-Saxon origin. An Irish one does not seem probable, but it may well have originated in England. It is not commonly found in the Breviaries, but is contained in three English Hymnaries of the eleventh century (Durham, B. iii.; Julius, A. vi.; Vespasian, D. xii.), as well as a MS. psalter of the same century, said to have been written at Winchester (CCC. 391), and Leofric's 'Collectarium' (Harl. 2961); while 'Jesu quadragenariæ' occurs in the first three of these as well as in the Breviaries of Aberdeen, Sarum, and York, together with a number of German Breviaries. It, therefore, may perhaps be set down as either English or German in origin. It would then appear that the state of the case with regard to St. Hilary's authorship of the hymns attributed to him is this: *Three* hymns may be claimed for him with some degree of certainty, viz. 'Lucis largitor splendide' and the two in the *Liber Hymnorum*, 'Felix propheta David' and 'Adæ cernis

<sup>1</sup> *Dict. of Hymnology*, p. 546.

<sup>2</sup> Migne, *Patrologia*, lxxii. 583.

<sup>3</sup> Of these it would appear that 'In matutinis surgimus' alone was originally in the old Mozarabic Breviary; the other two, 'Deus Pater ingenite' and 'Jam meta noctis transiit,' though found in Ximenes's edition of the Breviary, must have been added by him from some (now unknown) source. See the *Dictionary of Hymnology*, art. 'Breviaries.'

<sup>4</sup> *Hymni Latini Medii Ævi*, i. 78. Mone gives the text as found in a Stuttgart Breviary of the eleventh century.

gloriam.' *Two* are possibly (but by no means certainly) by him, 'Hymnum dicat turba fratrum' and 'Ad cœli clara non sum dignus sidera.' Of the rest *three* ought certainly to be struck out of the list—'Beata nobis gaudia,' 'Jesus refulsit omnium,' and 'Jesu quadragenariæ'<sup>1</sup>—and in the case of the three which remain, 'Deus Pater ingenite,' 'In matutinis surgimus,' and 'Jam meta noctis transit,' though the hymns are certainly ancient and *may* possibly be his, there is absolutely no early evidence connecting them with his name. Had space permitted we should have been glad to go through the list of hymns attributed to St. Ambrose and St. Gregory the Great in a similar way; but we must leave the subject of hymn-writers and pass on to say something of the articles referring to special hymns.

Perhaps the most thorough and exhaustive article in the whole volume is that contributed by the Bishop of Salisbury on the 'Te Deum.' It embodies the results of previous researches, and contains a good deal of original work as well, which distinctly advances our knowledge of the early history of the hymn. Reference should also be made to a supplemental article in the appendix, which contains additional matter of some importance. In the article in the main body of the *Dictionary* the Bishop had already accepted the conclusion, to which internal evidence pointed, that the original hymn consisted only of verses 1–21. But when this article was written no copy of the hymn was known to exist without the concluding verses, drawn (with the exception of a single verse) from the Psalms. Since then, however, a copy ending with verse 21 has actually been discovered in the British Museum, of which an account is given by the Bishop. The MS. (Harl. 7653) 'is in a bold Irish hand, apparently of the eighth century.' Attention was first drawn towards it by Mr. Walter de Gray Birch, who printed in an appendix to a volume edited for the Hampshire Record Society<sup>2</sup> in 1889 what he rather oddly described as 'a hymn somewhat resembling' the 'Te Deum.' It does not 'somewhat resemble' it, but actually *is* the 'Te Deum' itself, the text being, perhaps, the most original form extant. It confirms the other Irish texts of the hymn in what the Bishop calls 'the most appro-

<sup>1</sup> The earliest ascription of these three hymns to St. Hilary appears to be in the *Poetarum Veterum Opera* of G. Fabricius (Basle, 1563).

<sup>2</sup> An ancient MS. of the eighth or ninth century, formerly belonging to St. Mary's Abbey or Nunnaminster, Winchester; edited by Walter de Gray Birch. Issued by the Hampshire Record Society, 1889. The text of the 'Te Deum' as contained in this MS. was also printed by Mr. F. E. Warren in the *Academy* for June 6, 1891.

priat  
liber  
seven  
the  
publ  
small  
great  
form  
form  
A  
Deu  
Bish  
lang  
son's  
time  
ing  
alas  
Briti  
tain  
those  
the  
(if w  
teen  
Plan  
ment  
hexa  
'De  
of th  
St. B  
taken  
many  
has



priate and probably correct reading' in verse 16, 'Tu ad liberandum *mundum* suscepisti hominem,' and it also has several extremely peculiar readings which are duly noted in the article before us. We believe that the MS. is to be published before long by the Henry Bradshaw Society, and small as it is (it only consists of seven leaves) it will be a great boon to liturgical students to have it in a convenient form.

Another feature of special interest in the article on the 'Te Deum' is the section on the *versions* of the hymn. The Bishop gives references to a considerable number in different languages, some of which have been printed in Mr. Thomson's little book, while others are noticed here for the first time. The list, however, is not quite complete, as the following might be added to it. An Anglo-Saxon version, now, alas! almost illegible, is contained in Vitellius, E. xviii., in the British Museum, while Nero, C. iv., in the same collection, contains a French version, which differs slightly from any of those to which the article alludes, and yet another is found in the Mazarine Library at Paris (No. 258). Again, there are (if we mistake not) two or three Flemish versions of the fourteenth or fifteenth century in MS. 'Horæ' in the Musée Plantin at Antwerp. Very curious also, and fully worthy of mention, is the startling attempt to turn the hymn into Latin hexameters found in the poem of Candidus of Fulda (A.D. 840), 'De Vita Ægili.' It occurs in his account of the dedication of the Church of Fulda, and the translation of the relics of St. Boniface, and, as it is not well known, nor is any notice taken of it in the *Dictionary*, we insert a copy of it here, with many apologies for the errors in prosody of which its author has been guilty:—

'Te ergo Deum laudamus te dominumque fatemur ;  
Te genitorem perpetuum terra veneratur ;  
Cuncti tibi angelicus astans mirabilis ordo  
Namque poli cunctæque potestates venerandæ,  
Cherubin quoque Seraphin pariterque verentes  
Jure tibi soli incessanti voce reclamant.  
Sanctus Sanctus Sanctus enim Dominus Deus unus  
Sabaoth, cœli magna tellusque replentur  
Doxa perpetuæ majestatis : quoque temet  
Cœtus apostolicus pollens atque inclitus ordo,  
Teque prophetarum numerus laudabilis æque,  
Te nitidus testum laudat exercitus ardens,  
Ecclesia de sacra canit diffusa per orbem  
Majestatis enim patrem immensæ venerandum,  
Atque tuum proprio verum de pectore natum,

Sanctum nam paracletum æquali numine flatum.  
 Tu doxæ rex ac lucis, lux ardua Christus ;  
 Tu genitoris es æternus sine tempore natus.  
 Tu hominem suscepisti mundum ad liberandum<sup>1</sup>  
 Virginis atque uterum non horruit alta potestas.  
 Devicto mortis stimulo tu victor ubique,  
 Fidis nam miserans reserasti regna polorum.  
 Tu partis in dextra regnas virtute perenni  
 Desuper adveniens certus namque arbiter orbis,  
 Te petimus proni, proprios defende colonos  
 Mundi quos proprio redemisti sanguine, Soter.  
 Salvum fac populum hostis de fauce reductum,  
 Atque tuam dignare, Deus, benedicere sortem,  
 Auxilioque tuo rege sublimato per ævum et  
 Omni quippe die temet benedicimus alte,  
 Laudamusque tuum cuncta per sæcula nomen.  
 Hacce die nos, Christe potens, dignare tueri,  
 Neu nos commaculent spurcæ contagia vitæ.  
 O nostri miserere, Deus, nostri miserere,  
 Sitque tua circa nosmet miseratio larga.  
 Corde quidem fixo veluti confidimus in te ;  
 In te, summe Deus, spero, non turber in ævum.'

A great contrast to the article on the 'Te Deum' is afforded by that on the 'Gloria in excelsis,' which is most disappointing. No attempt whatever is made to advance our knowledge of the early history of this hymn, nor does Mr. Julian appear to have availed himself of the published materials which were easily accessible to him. He tells us little more than may be found in the late Dr. Swainson's article in the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, published in 1875, and no use has been made of anything which has appeared since then.<sup>2</sup> Again, while notice is taken of modern English and German translations, there is no account whatever of any ancient ones. Early French versions are by no means uncommon. There is one, for instance, in the 'Eadwine Psalter,' in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge (R. 17, 1), and another, with a paraphrase in addition, in the Mazarine Library at Paris (No. 258), while Anglo-Saxon versions, differing more or less from each other, may be found in the Eadwine Psalter, as well as in various manuscripts in the British Museum (Reg. 2 B. v.; Vitellius, E. xviii.; Arundel, 60); and the following early translations into English verse ought certainly to have been

<sup>1</sup> It will be noticed that the rendering here supports the reading *mundum*.

<sup>2</sup> Reference might have been made, e.g., to an article in this *Review*, vol. xxi., and to a useful note in Dr. Bright's edition of *St. Leo's Sermons on the Incarnation*, p. 146.

noticed in the *Dictionary*. It is taken from the *Lay Folks' Mass Book*, edited for the Early English Text Society by Canon Symonds, and is assigned by its editor to the reign of Edward I. :—

'Joy be unto God in heuen  
 With alkyns myrthe þat men may neuene ;  
 And pese in erthe, alle men vntille,  
 þat rightwis are, & of gode wille.  
 We loue þe, lord God almyghty,  
 And als we blesse þe bisyly.  
 We worship þe, als worthi es,  
 And makes joy to þe more and les ;  
 We thank þe God of al þi grace,  
 For þo grete joy þat þou hase,  
 Our lord, oure God, our king heuenly,  
 Oure God, our fadir almyghty.  
 Our lord, þo son of God of heuen,  
 Jhesu Crist, comly to neuene,  
 Oure lord, lamb of God, name we þe,  
 And Son of God, þi fadir fre.  
 Þou þat wostis þo worlds synne,  
 Hauue mercie on vs, more and mynne ;  
 Þou þat wostis þo worlds wrake,  
 Our praiere in þis tyme þou take ;  
 Þou þat sittes on þi fadir right hande,  
 With merci help vs here lyuande,  
 For þou art holly, made of none,  
 Bot of þi selue and lord alone.  
 Þou art þo heghest, of wisdom most,  
 Jhesu Crist with þo holy Gost,  
 Wonand with þo fadre of heuen,  
 In more joy þen mon may neuene ;  
 Vnto þat ioy, Ihesu, vs ken  
 Thorght prayere of þi modre, Amen.'

It is also a disappointment not to find any fresh light thrown on the origin and history of the evening hymn of the Early Church, beginning, *Φῶς ἱλαρὸν ἁγίας δόξης ἀθανάτου πατρὸς οὐρανόθεν*, so widely known through Mr. Keble's exquisite translation, 'Hail, gladdening light.'<sup>1</sup> The short article devoted to it contains nothing new. Reference is made to Usher, *De Symbolis*, and Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacre*, as well as to Daniel, but no notice is taken of Thomas Smith's account of it,<sup>2</sup> nor is there any notice of MSS. containing it. It would have been well to have made an examination of some of these, as to the best of our belief the hymn does not occur in

<sup>1</sup> *Lyra Apostolica*, No. lxiii. ; *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, No. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Miscellanea*, vol. i. p. 151.

early Greek Psalters with anything like the same frequency as the morning hymn (viz. the 'Gloria in excelsis'). It is, however, found in the following Psalters: Paris, Bibl. Reg. Gr. xxii., of the eleventh century (*ὕμνος ἑσπερινός*); Suppl. Gr. 343, of the twelfth century (*ᾠσμα ἑσπερινόν*); Cambridge, CCC. 480, of the thirteenth century (*ὕμνος ἑσπερινός*); and Oxford, Bodl. Misc. Gr. 5, of the ninth century, and of these certainly the two latter have the reading *Ἦμνοῦμεν Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ Ἅγιον πνεῦμα Θεοῦ*, and not *Θεόν*, as in Daniel's text, which is given by Mr. Julian. *Θεόν* is regularly found in all the printed editions of the *Horologion* from the sixteenth century onwards, but the genitive case is supported by the quotation from the hymn in St. Basil,<sup>1</sup> and we suspect that it would be found in all early MSS. of the hymn. The earliest copy of the hymn with the modern readings (*Θεόν* for *Θεοῦ*, *αἰσiais* for *ὁσiais*, διὸ for δι' ὅν), which we have noticed, is contained in a fourteenth-century *Horologion* in the British Museum (*Add.* 22507). Again, with regard to the statement in the *Dictionary* that 'in modern Liturgical books the hymn is attributed to Sophronius,' it should be noted that this is certainly not always the case. In the earliest printed copies of the *Horologion*, such as those published at Florence in 1520 and Venice in 1532, the hymn appears without any title. The first which we have examined which ascribes it to Sophronius, is an edition published at Venice in 1581. From this time forward the ascription regularly keeps its place till the present century; but in modern editions, such as those published at Venice in 1860 and 1884, the title stands as follows: *Ποίημα παλαιὸν ἢ, ὡς τινες λέγουσιν, Ἀθηνογένους τοῦ Μάρτυρος*. The attribution of the hymn to Athenogenes is probably merely due to a misunderstanding of St. Basil's words, and is quite worthless; but the facts stated show that the statement made in the *Dictionary* requires qualification.<sup>2</sup>

There is one more point connected with the hymns of the Early Church on which something should be said. In the article on Doxologies a statement is made concerning the 'Gloria Patri' to this effect:—

'No doubt the second half is later than the first half, and was added afterwards, but at a date which it is impossible to fix exactly. It must have been before A.D. 529, in which year the second Council of Vaison (can. 6) enjoins the use of the second half in France, as

<sup>1</sup> *De Spiritu Sancto*, c. xxix.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the title as given by Goar from the *Horologion*: "Ὑμνος τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Ἀθηνογένους, οὗ ὡς φασὶ τινες ἀμαθῶς Σωφρονίου Πατριάρχου Ἱεροσολύμων μάρτυρος τούτου ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος. *Euchologion*, p. 25, n. 36.

being  
Italy, a  
Son of

This  
doubt  
refers  
be see

'E  
Orient  
tutiam  
cœpiss  
princip  
dicend

It  
of the  
Trinit  
Arian  
remain  
sæcul  
of this  
held.  
alone.  
430) s  
Sanct  
the fo  
speak  
in the  
sung  
of the  
which  
respon  
rest of

Δό  
αἰώνας

And t  
with p  
sembl  
The a

'P  
that w  
junctiv  
"by"

being already in general use throughout the whole East, Africa, and Italy, and as directed against heretics who denied the eternity of the Son of God.<sup>1</sup>

This is the common account given of it, but it is very doubtful whether it is quite exact. The canon of Vaison refers only to the words 'As it was in the beginning,' as will be seen from the exact terms of it, which we proceed to give:—

'Et quia non solum in Sede Apostolica, sed etiam per totum Orientem et totam Africam, vel Italiam, propter hæreticorum astutiam, qui Dei Filium non semper cum Patre fuisse, sed a tempore cœpisse blasphemant, in omnibus clausulis post *Gloria, sicut erat in principio* dicitur, etiam et nos in universis ecclesiis nostris hoc ita dicendum esse decernimus.'

It was, as the canon states, on account of the Arian denial of the eternal generation of the second Person of the Holy Trinity that the words in question were added. But the Arians would not have found much, if any, difficulty in the remainder of the clause, 'Et nunc et semper et in sæcula sæculorum,' and there is evidence that at any rate some part of this was in use some time before the Council of Vaison was held. Indeed we doubt whether 'the first half' was ever used alone. It is true that Cassian (writing between A.D. 420 and 430) speaks only of the form 'Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto,'<sup>1</sup> but his words *need* not be taken as implying that the form used was *confined* to these words. Moreover he speaks as if the form to which he alludes was current not only in the West but in the East as well, noting that there it was sung not after every psalm, but only once at the conclusion of the entire psalmody of the office. The form, however, which is used in the East to-day, while it has nothing corresponding to the 'Sicut erat in principio' of the West, has the rest of the concluding verse—

Δόξα Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ δὲ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων Ἀμήν.

And the well-known story of Leontius of Antioch supplies us with positive proof that this or some form very closely resembling it was already in use before the days of Cassian. The account is given by Theodoret, and runs as follows:—

'Perceiving that the clergy and laity were divided in opinion, and that when praise was offered to the Son some introduced the conjunctive particle "*and*," while others made use of the preposition "*by*" (διὰ), with reference to the Son, and of "*in*" (ἐν) with reference

<sup>1</sup> *Instit.* II. c. viii.

to the Holy Ghost, he repeated the doxologies in an under-tone of voice, so that those who were placed nearest him could only hear the words "for ever and ever" (*eis τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*).<sup>1</sup>

It is possible that *καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ* had not yet been added. The words are not found in the form given in the treatise *De Virginitate*, formerly ascribed to St. Athanasius,<sup>2</sup> nor are they in the form used by the Spanish Church after its renunciation of Arianism;<sup>3</sup> but what is certain is this: (1) 'in sæcula sæculorum' was in use long before the Council of Vaison, and (2) the words of the canon refer only to 'sicut erat in principio.'<sup>4</sup> The point may seem to be a small one, but we have called attention to it because the inaccuracy is so very widely spread, and appears in many of the ordinary text-books.

There is much more which might be said on this most interesting *Dictionary*, but we have (we fear) already exceeded the limits allotted to us. Had space permitted we would willingly have given some account of the articles on some of the best-known of our English hymns. Very full and instructive are the discussions on the curious textual questions connected with more than one of them.<sup>5</sup> But for these we must content ourselves with referring our readers to the pages of the *Dictionary* itself, and thus we take our leave of Mr. Julian, once more expressing our hearty thanks for the work which he has done, for which all lovers of hymnology owe him a real debt of gratitude.

<sup>1</sup> Theodoret, *H. E.* II. xxiv.

<sup>2</sup> [Ath.] *De Virg.* § 14.

<sup>3</sup> See the decree of the fourth Council of Toledo (A.D. 633), can. 12, and the Mozarabic Missal for Christmas Day, Migne, vol. lxxxv. p. 183.

<sup>4</sup> There is a difficulty about the statement in the canon that these words were used 'throughout the whole East.' They were certainly not used there, and either (1) the Fathers were misinformed or (2) 'Occidentem' should be read in the place of 'Orientem.'

<sup>5</sup> *E.g.* Bishop Ken's morning and evening hymns, as well as 'Jerusalem, my happy home,' 'Rock of Ages, cleft for me,' 'Hark, the herald angels sing,' &c., not omitting 'God save the Queen,' which is here reckoned as a hymn, and has a most interesting article devoted to its curious history.

ART. I

Forty Year  
search  
ATK  
of A  
Diale  
Rieve  
With

WE can  
the hands  
Moorland  
the autho  
which he  
folklore o  
that wins  
and varie  
unwearie  
for forty  
how muc  
found in  
which the  
There is  
pastoral  
cities.  
labourer  
by the m  
without s  
labourers  
densely p  
dreds sca  
less need  
the pries  
which w  
service a  
for count  
mistaken  
for spiri  
fear, unq  
excellen  
land par  
that can



## ART. IX.—FORTY YEARS IN A MOORLAND PARISH.

*Forty Years in a Moorland Parish: Reminiscences and Researches in Danby, in Cleveland.* By the Rev. J. C. ATKINSON, D.C.L., Incumbent of the Parish; Author of *A History of Cleveland, Glossary of the Cleveland Dialect*, &c.; Editor of *The Whitby Chartulary, The Rievaulx Chartulary, The Furness Coucher Book*, &c. With Maps. (London, 1891).

WE can hardly imagine a more desirable book to place in the hands of students for holy orders than *Forty Years in a Moorland Parish*. It is not so much the charm with which the author invests his narrative, nor the thoroughness with which he handles the several questions of local history or folklore or science which he in turn brings before the reader that wins our admiration; it is the fact that a man of rich and varied culture should have been able to find matter of unwearied interest in a remote moorland agricultural parish for forty years, and that the record of his life should show how much of all that makes life worth living is to be found in every corner of Old England. The truth is one which there is special need to insist on in the present day. There is a strong tendency amongst young men to seek for pastoral charges amongst the crowded streets of our populous cities. The exodus from the village of the agricultural labourer finds its counterpart in the avoidance of village cures by the most earnest of our younger priesthood. It goes without saying that where the harvest is thickest the need for labourers is the sorest, and that the cry of thousands in densely populated streets rises higher than that of the hundreds scattered on the hills. But the latter also have priceless needs, and in ministering to them the earlier years of the priesthood might be profitably spent under conditions which would make many a neophyte a fitter instrument for service afterwards in a wider field. That the supply of clergy for country parishes does really suffer owing to the strangely mistaken delusion that a village does not present ample scope for spiritual or intellectual energy in our own days is, we fear, unquestionable, and we hold that Dr. Atkinson has done excellent service in showing how much of interest a moorland parish can present to eyes that can see and to a mind that can reason.

It is possible that the effect produced by Dr. Atkinson's volume may be the deeper because he leaves the directly spiritual work of the parish priest untouched in this record of forty years. His pages are engrossed with other topics, antiquarian and legendary, historical and scientific; with the manners and customs, the dwellings and habits of his moorland flock; with notes on the aspect of nature, and of his own experience of her sternness on the Yorkshire hills; with glimpses into days far preceding the Domesday record, and stories of superstition that is still not entirely uprooted in this nineteenth century. The discussion of Danby folklore (on which we shall have something more to say presently) suggests to Dr. Atkinson points of analogy, or rather of connexion, with Odin-worship, and the writer's acquaintance with archæology results in an amusing refutation of antiquarian theories which could boast the support of high authority. Simple as the theme may appear, the record of *Forty Years in a Moorland Parish*, as handled in these pages, demands for its full elucidation stores of learning, scientific, antiquarian, and historical, of no meagre volume, and as we pass from subject to subject we are abundantly convinced that we are under the guidance of a master's hand. We took up the volume with visions of simple authorship, such as we might place on a shelf beside the *Complete Angler* or the *Natural History of Selborne*. Instead of nothing save the quaint pastoral which should wile away the leisure hour of a jaded critic, we have also many a tough problem dissected with stern dialectic and multifarious learning.

This unexpected but not unwelcome presentation suggests the thought that it would be a curious question to determine how much of gain or loss mankind has suffered through the intellectual progress of modern days. Are we able to enjoy nature with the same unalloyed fulness of satisfaction as those simpler souls among our forefathers who were content to drink in her charms without attempting to analyse their contents, or to distinguish between the elements that compose them? Is the modern spirit which classifies and theorises, and which gathers in the process a deeper insight into the marvellous wisdom which underlies all phenomena—is this spirit cultivated at no cost of pure pleasure which those who went before us quaffed without misgiving? We are almost disposed to think that such is indeed the case; that of nature it may be said, as Hartley Coleridge said of truth—

‘Her very beauty they alone discover  
Who for herself, not for her beauty, love her;’

that  
with  
to va  
ignor  
sider  
amou  
bark  
if sh  
of H  
finer  
lectu  
Prob  
a dis  
When  
was  
mean  
brain  
we ar  
in *For*  
able  
plicit  
of so  
the th  
with  
adage  
mind  
in Cl  
as ar  
most  
propo  
to be  
young  
to his  
had e  
suppo  
a mar  
D  
to Da  
and n  
at the  
startl  
great  
tricts  
of a  
whoso

that there is a certain ineffable bloom, which can only exist with old-fashioned simplicity of admiration, and which seems to vanish under modern scientific handling; that, in a sense, ignorance of science (or what a well-read physicist would consider such) is the mother of genuine love of nature; that the amount of our intellectual insight has heavily weighted the bark which used formerly to glide lightly over waters which, if shallower, were as sweet and pure; that the impressions of Homer, which Pope says were *taken off at a heat*, had a finer flavour than the elaborate expositions of a professor lecturing a University extension class amongst ourselves. Probably the true answer to this question would be found in a distinction between the artistic and the scientific spirit. Where poetry has been extinguished—as Darwin confessed was his own case, and as is doubtless that of thousands of meaner men—the exclusive and one-sided cultivation of the brain has a tendency to atrophize heart and feeling. Perhaps we are hypercritical in saying that there is a certain hardness in *Forty Years in a Moorland Parish*, which may be attributable to this cause. It lacks the indescribable charm of simplicity which pervades the older pastorals, as well as the pages of some contemporary essayists. Yet even as we write this the thought is borne in upon us that after all the fault may be with ourselves. Dr. Atkinson's book signally illustrates the adage that 'beauty is in the eye of the beholder.' To a mind less well furnished a forty years' residence at Danby, in Cleveland, would not have been fruitful with such results as are here given us. The remotest village, as well as the most famous historic town, is pregnant with interest in exact proportion to the intelligence and learning which are brought to bear upon the investigation of them. Some years ago a young gentleman, when making the grand tour, wrote home to his father that he had reached Rome late in the afternoon, had enjoyed a good dinner, and left the next morning, and we suppose that a longer stay would hardly have done much for a man of such mental fibre.

Dr. Atkinson gives an amusing account of his first visit to Danby, and even to those who are familiar with the position and manner of living of the clergy upon the Yorkshire wolds at the commencement of the present century the picture is a startling one. Yet so recently as the year (1851) of the first great International Exhibition the country clergy of remote districts, both north and south, included many quaint specimens of a character now happily fast dying out of memory, and whose lives sufficiently account for the hold which Noncon-

formity acquired throughout England and Wales. When a steady Church layman could inform the new vicar that he had been to church four times in a single year when the parson had failed to put in an appearance; when a single service, slovenly performed, was the only office even on the Sunday; when, as old men have told us in other parishes, the congregation during prayers was often larger and noisier outside the church than in it—what wonder if any symptoms of religious life were only to be found amongst Quakers and Methodists? Such at least was the state of things at the moment of Dr. Atkinson's arrival. He had some foretaste of the old-world life on which he was about to enter as he set out to ride from Whitby for the scene of his future labours. A few miles on his way he met a team of twenty horses and oxen, half of either kind, dragging a load of stone up a steep hill-side road, at the foot of which four other waggons, similarly laden, were waiting until the combined draught should descend and fetch them up one by one. On the summit of the moor which had to be crossed a choice of roads without a readable direction-post caused a perplexity which a passing horsewoman failed to clear up. But the beauty of the scene—and Yorkshire moors have, we think, a special fascination for the eyes of southerners—more than compensated for any fatigue or delay in reaching the house the author was in search of.

The parsonage 'was a long, low grey building, on a sort of grassy terrace by the roadside, and with nothing between it and the roadway. At one end were a cowhouse and other like premises, and at the other a low lean-to shed appearing to give access to some sort of back kitchen or scullery. Beyond the one window which looked out upon the highway was a door, twin to the one opening into the cowhouse, and quite innocent of any such appendage as a knocker or bell—innocent even, one would have suspected, of any nascent suspicion that such things existed. But seeing no other door, and no way that seemed to lead to any other, I made up my mind to knock at this one. I knocked once, twice, and again, with no response. I learned in after days that I ought to have gone to the door in the lean-to, the only one in use by all members of the family; for there in the kitchen, which was also the living-room, as it presently appeared, I should have found father and mother, son and four daughters, who with the daytall man (who was working for the father and with the son) were just sitting down to dinner' (pp. 42-3).

After partaking of the meal arranged in this patriarchal fashion—and it is well to remember that it was the habitual custom of our forefathers for the entire household, master,

serv  
wasunloc  
the "  
the sAltho  
shabl  
The  
the o  
withpiece  
coloucover  
to crwas a  
Sundthey  
my in  
fact.descri  
over twith h  
insideThe f  
cup, c  
paltry

beside

T  
the bschool  
his omudd  
moutsurpri  
whenarouse  
the hservan  
dationlaid up  
all theof a n  
rapid dincom  
to grap  
VOL

servants, and guests—to join at one common board—a visit was proposed to the church.

‘After a walk of a mile and a half it was reached, and the door unlocked, and we entered. It must suffice to say that my conductor, the “minister,” entered without removing his hat, and walked through the sacred building and up to the holy table with his hat still on. Although I had seen many an uncared for church and many a shabby altar, I thought I had reached the furthest extreme now. The altar table was not only rickety and with one leg shorter than the others, and besides that mean and worm-eaten, but it was covered with what it would have been a severe and sarcastic libel to call a piece of green baize; for it was in rags, and of any or almost every colour save the original green. And even that was not all. It was covered thickly over with stale crumbs. It seemed impossible not to crave some explanation of this; and the answer to my enquiry was as nearly as possible in the following terms: “Why, it is the Sunday school teachers. They must get their meat somewhere, and they get it here.” It may be thought I am romancing, drawing upon my imagination, but indeed I am not; I am detailing the literal fact. And everything was in hateful harmony with what I have thus described. There lay the dirty, shabby surplice, flung negligently over the altar railing, itself paintless and broken, and the vestment with half its length trailing on the dirty, unswept floor. The pulpit inside was reeking with accumulated dust and scraps of torn paper. The font was an elongated, attenuated reproduction of a double egg-cup, or hour-glass without the sustaining framework; and in it was a paltry slop-basin, lined with dust, and an end or two of tallow candle beside it’ (pp. 44-5).

That the font was hardly ever used, inasmuch as most of the baptisms were performed in private houses; that the schoolmaster, a brother of the parson, had been selected for his office because ‘he could dee nowght else;’ he had muddled away his land and was put in as teacher ‘that he mout get a bite o’ brëad;’ that the school, upon a ‘visit of surprise’ being paid, was a perfect bear garden, into which, when admission had been at last obtained, the master was aroused from a drunken sleep by the unwonted stillness; that the houses occupied by tenants who could engage several servants were so arranged as to involve intense moral degradation, and the cottages little more than a high-pitched roof laid upon the ground-level, and heightened by a sunken floor—all these are details which give an insight into the rude life of a not remote past, upon which we cannot now dwell. So rapid a glance at them is sufficient to show that an ecclesiastical income of 95*l.* was hardly likely to tempt an educated man to grapple on mercenary grounds with so fine a field for work

VOL. XXXIV.—NO. LXXVIII.

H H

upon a spot which a friend of the author declared to have been undiscovered when Bonaparte was shipped to St. Helena, or else they would not have taken the trouble to send him so far away.

So primitive a people was likely to afford abundant store of antique folk-lore, and Dr. Atkinson devotes one of the largest sections of his book to Hobs and fairies, wise men and witches, and to the faith which his parishioners placed in them. The indefinite and indefinable apprehension of shadowy and often malignant beings, and the strange and superstitious modes of so meeting them as to avert any evil influence, which still retain their hold over many educated persons, come out into clear prominence amongst the uncultured dale-folk of half a century ago. We do not suppose that the solicitor who took off his hat with much ceremony to a magpie, or the lady who carried home a horseshoe from a crowded street in York to hang it wrong side upwards with a dozen predecessors, could offer any intelligible account of their action. It is only a sort of 'use and wont' that induces (as we have known to be the case) a lady of exceptional intelligence and culture invariably to curtsy many times at first sight of a new moon, or to refuse to leave the window even to welcome a friend until crows, which alighted upon the lawn, had resumed their flight, or to reject with unfeigned dislike the bringing home of a harmless branch of blackthorn blossom. It is only a few days since that we were gravely informed that a red silk-skein worn round the throat was prophylactic against hæmorrhage; and many an old wife's specific is still asserted to prove a practical charm against some forms of disease for whose efficacy no scientific account can be rendered. It would be interesting if such superstitious usages could be traced to their origin before their final disappearance under the changes which the spread of education is generating everywhere.

Forty years ago many a strange superstition held full sway at Danby. The subject of witchcraft was too serious, and its possible consequences too appalling, to be lightly touched upon; but when the new vicar had gained the confidence of his flock some of the elder people spoke out unreservedly their esoteric convictions. Were there such things as witches? Of course there were; and their malignant habits, and the most effectual mode of checking them, were elaborately detailed. The most prevalent persuasion was a belief that certain old women were possessed of a power, which reads like the counterpart of the were-wolf, of assum-

THE END OF THE WORLD

ing o  
mitte  
result  
efficac  
in th  
those  
select  
fired  
and n  
in be  
memb

TH  
leads  
of the  
convic  
not a  
upon  
of the  
is stra  
may l  
monie  
and t  
withou  
nothin  
drawn  
much  
the mo  
these v  
off fro  
birth t  
a mish  
of the  
back w  
uncons  
worship  
dis it y  
syne it  
dee it a  
borate  
and to  
a man's  
heart o  
on a cl  
nine ne  
to the



ing on occasion the form of a hare, in whose guise they committed their depredations. Cases had been tried, and the result had proved the accuracy of the suspicion and the efficacy of the remedy. Everyone knew that certain witches, in the shape of hares, were milk stealers, but woe betide those who chased them with a black dog. From a carefully selected station a watcher had on more than one occasion fired with unerring aim at a pussy with great glowering eyes, and next day some notorious beldame was invariably laid up in bed, sorely suffering from wounds in the corresponding members.

The universal prevalence of the witch and the wise man leads Dr. Atkinson into speculations upon the origin of some of these superstitions, upon the mixture of shrewdness and conviction of their own supernatural powers which marked not a few of those who gained so weird a reputation, and upon the possible connexion of animal magnetism with some of the wonders declared to have been wrought by them. It is strange to remark how persistent is the notion that charms may be effected through compliance with grotesque ceremonies that present no intelligible grounds for inspiring hope, and that the same unmeaning rites have been repeated without question for generation after generation. To say nothing of such prophylactics as the witchwood, or the charm drawn out as a diagram smothered over with sacred names and much confused gibberish, there are two examples for which the most indisputable antiquity can be claimed. The first of these was practised by shrewd, hard-headed farmers to ward off from their cattle any danger, lest the cows should give birth to their calves prematurely. The remedy against such a mishap was to bury an abortive calf beneath the threshold of the cowhouse, in a hole so deep that it could lie on its back with all its four feet stretching vertically upwards. All unconscious that he would be performing an act of Odin worship, a parishioner told Dr. Atkinson: 'There's many as dis it yet. My ou'd father did it. But it's sae many years syne it must be about wore out by now, and I shall have to dee it again.' The other example is the employment of elaborate incantations to serve as an antidote against witchery, and to counteract the witch's malicious plottings to injure a man's cattle. As we read the injunctions to prepare the heart of one of the miscreant's victims exactly at midnight on a clean cloth, and to stick it carefully with nine new pins, nine new needles, and nine new nails, our memory returns to the 'Epodes of Horace or to the depositions drawn out

when the great poisoning cases were under trial in the days of the Grand Monarque at the Bastille. By what singular perversion of the intellect could anything so irrational have been deemed to be efficacious in either the upper or the lower world?

It is, of course, extremely difficult to define the degree of faith which these rustic folk really put either in the efficacy of incantations or in the powers of the fairies and dwarfs, of whose existence they spoke as beyond all question. Their unwillingness to talk about such uncanny topics is no slight proof of deep-seated, if only shadowy, dread of them. And in communicative moods the older people would stoutly insist upon the evidences afforded by fairy rings and fairy butter, by the mysterious sounds of nocturnal clothes-washing and bleaching, by their butter smeared in the morning all over the gate, by the circles it would be awful to compass round in running nine times over. One old lady actually had known a lass quite well who had raked over a fairy bairn in a hay-field. It was as bonny a little thing as ever was seen, but its fairy mother could not do without it, and it soon pined away and died. Still more circumstantial is the description of Hart Hall Hob, the dwarf who had been espied by night threshing in Hart Hall barn. The little man, 'amaist as nakt as when he wur boorn,' worked so prodigiously that, in pity for his condition, it was decided to provide him with some decent clothing. The sequel of the story is interesting for the light it casts both upon the supposed temper of the mysterious visitant and upon the probable antiquity of the legend on which it is based.

'The wintry nights were cold, and the Hart Hall folks thought Hob must get strange and warm, working "sikan a bat as yan, an it wad be sair an' cau'd for him, gannan oot iv lathe wiv nobbut thae au'd rags. Se ear, they'd mak him something to hap hissel wiv." And so they did. They made it as near like what the boy had described him as wearing—a sort of a coarse sack or shirt, with a belt or girdle to confine it round his middle. And when it was done it was taken before nightfall and laid in the barn, "gay and handy for t' lahtle chap to notish" when next he came to resume his nocturnal labours. In due course he came, espied the garment, turned it round and round, and—contrary to the usual termination of such legends, which represents the uncanny, albeit efficient, worker as displeased at the espionage practised upon him—Hart Hall Hob, more mercenary than punctilious as to considerations of privacy, broke out with the following couplet:—

"Gin Hob must hae nowght but a hardin' hamp,  
He'll coom nae mair, nowther to berry nor stamp."

'I  
jingle  
almos  
later,  
better  
folk-s  
such a  
of Cle  
four t  
speak  
words  
which  
rhyme  
the ve  
barley  
"berry  
years,  
had re  
earlies  
the w  
questi  
taking  
dimly  
Englis  
For it  
was n  
raimen  
little w  
the "h  
fairly v  
that at  
seems

Th  
traces  
skilful  
very; v  
usual  
around  
sup' f  
three  
late ov  
seem a  
singula  
not be  
in ante  
notion  
'Th  
require

'I pause a moment in my narrative here to remark that this old jingle or rhyme is one of no ordinary or trifling interest. It seems almost superfluous to suggest that up to half a century ago, or even later, there was hardly a place in all her Majesty's English dominions better qualified to be conservative of the old words of the ordinary folk-speech, as well as of the old notions, legends, usages, beliefs, such as constitute its folk-lore, than this particular part of the district of Cleveland. The simple fact that its glossary comprises near upon four thousand words, and that still the supply is not fully exhausted, speaks volumes on that head. And yet this couplet preserves three words all of which had become obsolete forty years ago, and two of which had no actual meaning to the old dame who repeated the rhyme to me. These two are "berry" and "hamp." "Stamp" was the verb used to express the action of knocking off the awns of the barley previously to threshing it, according to the old practice. But "berry," meaning to thresh, I had been looking and enquiring for for years, and looking and enquiring in vain; and as to "hamp" I never had reason to suppose that it had once been a constituent part of the earliest Cleveland folk-speech. But this is not all. The meaning of the word, and no less the description given of the vestment in question, in the legend itself, throws back the origin, at least the forming, of the story, and its accompaniment, to an indefinite and yet dimly definable period. There was a time when the hamp was the English peasant's only garment, at all events mainly or generally so. For it might sometimes be worn over some underclothing. But that was not the rule. The hamp was a smock-frock-like article of raiment, gathered in somewhat about the middle, and coming some little way below the knee. The mention in *Piers the Plowman* of the "hatere" worn by the labouring man in his day serves to give a fairly vivid idea of the attire of the working man of that time, and that attire was the "hamp" of our northern parts. For the word seems to be clearly Old Danish in form and origin' (pp. 55-7).

There is one other topic of folk-lore which Dr. Atkinson traces to a Scandinavian source, and which he connects very skilfully with certain bee customs which not long since were very widely observed. On the death of the master it was usual to put the bees in mourning by winding a strip of black around the hives, and on the day of the funeral a 'bite and sup' from the funeral feast was carried to them, and with three taps they were solemnly informed of the decease of their late owner and of the name of his successor. It might not seem at first sight easy to establish any relation between so singular a practice and the 'coming again' of those who had not been satisfactorily buried—a conviction which prevailed in ante-Christian days—but the author combines the ghost notions and the bee notions as follows:—

'The departed bee owner, in his new condition of being, would require his appropriate arrows, axe, hammer, sword, what not. He

would require his appropriate "victuals and drink." But much of his drink had depended on the produce of his bees. All the mead that washed down the boar meat must depend still on the honey they produced. What wonder, then, that he should be idealized as wanting the busy makers, and should be likely to prefer his claim, and make it good moreover by actually "coming again" and taking possession, if not formally and effectually prevented? The suicide, the executed malefactor, down to not so very far back, even in enlightened England, was staked down in his grave, sometimes had his legs or arms strongly hampered with cord or by twisting, simply to prevent his "coming again," while in parts of Sweden the precautions taken were even of a stranger and (to modern ideas) far more revolting character. Nay, when the corpse was just newly taken from the dwelling-house, scarcely a century ago, the use was to scatter live embers just beyond the threshold, avowedly to bar the road back thither against the *gengångare* (coming-again being); and for the same reason, and with equally little reticence as to the object, the bee skeps were visited and a formal intimation conveyed to the occupants that the old owner was departed, and that no summons to wait on and serve him for the future was to be heeded. In fact, the more one really enters into the story of the folk-lore still surviving in these dales of ours, until lately so little accessible and so little intruded upon by the people and the opinions of the outside world, the more one finds to suggest how hard has been the struggle between the old paganism and the new Christianity. Survivals of this form or that of the old nature-worship, of the old cults of hero, demi-god, traditional divine ancestor, of this or that quaint, blurred, dim, obscure conception of man himself and his mysterious constitution and attributes, meet one at every turn' (p. 131).

The moorland parish presented a special field for anti-quarian research in the numerous tumuli enclosed within its boundaries. Exceptional care is requisite in house-digging enterprise, lest the treasure—generally some cinerary vase—should be injured at the moment of its disentanglement from the hiding-place it has occupied for some two thousand years. Grand days were spent on the moors amongst the grave hills, and the keenest interest in the result of the search was quickly engendered amongst the diggers employed in it. How fertile the quest eventually proved may be seen in the cases of the British Museum, where no less than forty-three cinerary vases, besides other objects, such as flint implements and jet beads, represent (although they are not grouped in one collection) this one district of Cleveland. With what care the larger houses were constructed is set forth in Dr. Atkinson's pages at some length. In some cases the object had evidently been first to destroy a previous barrow, the materials of which were deliberately 'scattered about in order to make room for, and

wait  
bone  
most  
a cir  
feet  
deep  
seven  
was  
could  
dyke  
where  
moon  
waye  
surro  
to ha  
thirty  
the s  
in su  
holds  
the b  
follow  
betw  
ing a  
shape  
well  
that

'the  
if left  
shall  
which  
"urn  
Chris  
durin  
mimic  
had n

All t  
to ex  
natur  
theses  
vived  
impo  
poran  
of sm  
etern  
V

wait in degraded subjection upon, the later deposit of the bones of a deceased superior.' In other instances with the most elaborate preparation a grave mound was designed upon a circular platform of symmetrically piled stone nearly twenty feet in diameter, whose entire surface was covered six inches deep with the whitest sand, such as could only be procured seven miles away. In another, again, the place of interment was marked by a cairn of stones, as heavy as a strong man could lift, indisputably brought from the Cleveland whinstone dyke, whose nearest point lay three miles and a half distant, whence each basaltic block had to be carried 'over untracked moor, with swamp and morass to cross and recross on the way.' Sometimes even these laborious monuments are again surrounded by an exterior ring of stones, sunk deeply enough to have withstood the long wear and tear of twenty-five or thirty centuries. Dr. Atkinson waxes eloquently scornful at the sneers of those who ridicule antiquarians for their interest in such great and abiding memorials—memorials he rightly holds to be fuller of material for thought than five-sixths of the books which cumber modern bookstalls. We can hardly follow his purpose in the further contrast which he draws between old grave-mounds and modern headstones. Allowing all the epithets he heaps upon the latter—'tasteless,' 'ill-shapen,' 'ugly,' 'meaningless,' 'hopeless,' 'wretched'—to be well deserved, they can at least claim the merit of an ugliness that soon passes away; allowing, too, that

'the great, imposing grave mounds will survive, as durable as ever, if left only to the hand of time, when the crosses on those grave slabs shall have mouldered away ages before; while as to the headstones which disfigure as well as crowd the churchyard, whereon the pagan "urn" contends for supremacy as an emblem—of what?—with the Christian cross, they are already put to self-invited shame by the enduringness of the piles which were raised to cover the urns they feebly mimic, the urns that enclosed the still enduring ashes of those who had no cross to cling to' (p. 151).

All this may be true, but surely the author does not mean to exalt pagan cremation above Christian burial. Man's natural hatred of extinction finds touching expression in these laborious efforts to build memorials which have survived so long, but which could no longer be regarded as important when a higher destiny was revealed. The temporary resting-place of the dissolved earthly tabernacle became of small concern in view of the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

We must refer the reader to Dr. Atkinson's own pages for

an amusing exposure of the Danby 'British villages,' which were elaborately described by some historians of Cleveland, and even found a place in the Ordnance Survey. The fact that some of the supposed dwellings were from eleven to twelve feet below the surface, that the site of others was on the very bleakest part of the lofty moorland, and that the town they composed would have been of vast size—two miles in length—that the imaginary dwellings followed a tortuous course, like the erratic vagaries of a frolicsome letter S with a curlicue at each end, and, finally, that the fortifications must have enclosed a truly stupendous area, presented apparently no insuperable difficulties to minds predetermined to find a marvellous British settlement. With cruel pertinacity Dr. Atkinson analyses these airy fancies, and demonstrates with an indisputable chain of well-linked evidence that the 'British villages' are but a series of mine pits from which the ironstone and jet in distant ages have been quarried.

The descriptive and geological section with which Dr. Atkinson would more appropriately have opened his account of Danby, occupies the centre of the volume. The parish encloses an area of 13,000 acres, and is wondrously diversified with hill and dale, the broken ground presenting a great variety of scenery. Hills and valleys abound, and at every turn a fresh view bursts upon the eye. It is amusing to contrast the flowery language in which the admiring vicar and his friends clothe their description of its beauties with the incisive dryness that seemed suitable to earlier historians. 'The general appearance of the parish is rather barren,' is all that Lewis<sup>1</sup> has to say of the external features of Danby. These dales 'differ from all others I have ever seen, and in this particular especially, that elsewhere you have to go in search of the beautiful views; here they come and offer themselves to be looked at,' was the verdict of an enthusiastic visitor, and, Dr. Atkinson adds emphatically, 'that is true.'

It would require more space than we can spare to dwell upon the geological features of the district, which are yet hardly of special interest to a stranger. The most picturesque part of the parish presents a lovely undercliff, against which in remote ages a great body of water beat, and by gradual eating out of the softer strata formed the dales and produced the infinite diversity of broken ground which augments so largely the beauty and variety of the scene. On one occasion Dr. Atkinson enjoyed a real vision of the long

<sup>1</sup> *Topographical Dictionary of England.*



distant past, as from a high point he commanded a view of Eskdale and all its tributaries filled with mist, on which the rays of the early sun so fell as to turn the lower ground into one vast sheet of water, so exact in resemblance to a huge inland lake that it was hard to believe it was a mere illusion, and as one object after another emerged from beneath the receding mass of vapour it was as if the flood were settling rapidly away and beginning to leave the trees and higher ground uncovered. The suppressed, or hardly suppressed, enthusiasm with which the author describes such a scene may help to answer the question we proposed at starting. Admiration for scenery of the more rugged type is very largely of modern growth, and we stand entranced before landscapes which presented nothing but horror to our forefathers. Many elements combine to generate a sense of the beautiful, and sometimes a startling reply, not merely of the *nil admirari* stamp, checks our fervour. An Englishman looking for the first time upon the great fall at Niagara said to a stranger by his side, 'Is it not amazing?' 'Not at all,' was the answer; 'the wonder would be if that water did not tumble down that place.'

To Dr. Atkinson's enthusiastic question, 'What do you think of the dales country?' the engineer of the North-Eastern Railway replied emphatically, 'It is a devil of a country.' The embankments on each side of the railway cuttings had been formed of soil which proved to be finely laminated with streaks of almost imperceptible sand, and the repeated landslips which resulted from such a stratification involved great unforeseen cost and labour. Scientific imagination, which realises the processes through which hill and dale have been fashioned and finished, is no unimportant element in the altered estimate of modern days which has changed the *infames scopuli* of classic detestation into the everlasting hills of our almost adoring wonder. So far, however, as any direct expression contained in the volume before us is concerned, the writer's thoughts upon creation and its Author are studiously repressed. Amidst the discussion of the causes which produced the treacherous nature of the soil and the description of the beauty of the Danby dales, all is so calm and subdued that we long for some such outburst of inner feeling as once fell on our ears as we watched the sunset across the Lake of Como—'Thrones, dominions, principalities, powers! all the earth doth worship Thee, the Father Everlasting!'

In so remote a district as Danby village life flows on

without much of incident, and such events as weddings and burials form a most important break in the dead level of ordinary routine. A daily life of the extremest simplicity, economy carried to such a pitch that one pair of leather breeches would serve for several generations in succession, unwearying labour uncomplainingly accepted as the natural condition of mankind, and hard fare varied only by great feasting on dried mutton or bacon, the consumption reaching huge quantities when some well-to-do dalesman was carried to his burial—such were the outer circumstances of life on the Cleveland moorland forty years ago. With the introduction of railways and newer methods of husbandry this primitive mode of living is rapidly passing away, and the old-fashioned greybeards shake their heads over the alarming degeneracy of these modern days.

Of wedding ceremonies we can make but passing mention. We presume even at Danby brides no longer reach the church door riding on a pillion. The running for a ribbon—the bride's gift—the race to the bride door, the draught of the bride ale, the procession of the bride wain, all are now doubtless over. The last occasionally took the form of very substantial wedding presents in olden days. A capacious wardrobe, well stored with linen, much of it probably the work of the spinster's own fingers, itself, like the wain it stood on, a gift, and in one case no less than sixteen oxen (also gifts), by which it was drawn, formed part of the marriage procession and stood at the church door during the ceremony. From a whole handful of uncounted money which one eager bridegroom placed on the book at the words, 'with all my worldly goods I thee endow,' it was *de règle* for the priest to take the clerk's fee and his own, and then to hand over the remainder to the bride.

Nor can we linger over burials and their accompaniments, although some of the latter were alike quaint in themselves and in their purpose. That strange intermixture of heathen superstition with outward Christian ritual! How singular the tone of mind which could combine with the use of our exquisite Burial Service such thoughts as prompted the laying of a piece of money between the dead man's lips and the introduction of pottery and charcoal into his coffin! A whole world of weird stories about spots being haunted, which had been the scenes of suicide or some atrocious deed of violence, is explained by the records contained in the Dooms books of the mutilation to which those convicted of such crimes were subjected. Despite every precaution to

prevent their revisiting the earth, they *had* to come again. Their wicked spirits could not find rest elsewhere. They were driven to wander round the scene of their misdeeds, and their suffering simulacra bore in shadowy outline the mutilated shape—headless perchance, or fettered—in which they had been to so little purpose ‘earth-fastened.’ Even in Dr. Atkinson’s time the threat of a strange old woman that unless she were carried to the graveyard by the church road she would come again was sufficient to ensure the fulfilment of her orders, despite almost overwhelming obstacles.

‘The old lady died in a snowy time, and the difficulties of the church road in a snowy time are almost intensely enhanced. . . . But the bearers faced the difficulties—perils, in a sense, they almost amounted to—and waist-deep sometimes. Still they persevered, and eventually got through with their undertaking and their burden. In plain words, they were ready to face anything, and many among them must have had such a day of toil and effort and fatigue as never before or after fell to their lot ; but they could not, dared not, face the chance of the old woman’s “coming again” ’ (p. 220).

Some of the usages recorded are not special to the Cleveland district. The selection of bearers from the same sex and age as the deceased, the gathering of a large body of followers—often fellow Sunday scholars, or others with but a slight bond of union—at the house whence the funeral is to start, the handing round by two selected persons of funeral biscuits of a special shape on a tray, on which are also glasses of wine and memorial cards, are practices common throughout the West Riding. The cards, cakes, and wine are rarely omitted even in the case of the very poor, but it is, or was until quite recently, customary for each mourner to place a piece of money on the tray, and in this way all funeral expenses were commonly defrayed. A singular, but generally quite unintentional, absence of reverence, as shown at Danby by the men wearing their hats in the church at a funeral, may possibly be an unhappy heritage from Puritan days ; on no point does the ordinary English labourer need more persistent teaching. Equally strange to those who have heard only the stately march of our ordered liturgy would seem the incongruous and incoherent utterances of many extempore prayers. Even the sedate deliverances of a Quaker speaker sometimes failed to avoid the painfully ludicrous. A much-respected and aged member was expected to say a few words at the burial of one of his fraternity. ‘And so he did. After looking long and fixedly into the grave in still silence he gave utterance at length to the following speech : “Our friend

seams vara comfortable. Thou mun hap him oop," these last words being addressed to the sexton' (pp. 224-5).

It would be difficult to exaggerate the strangeness of Church music half a century ago, not merely on the Yorkshire moors, but in many country districts south of the Trent. Old Uppingham boys will remember how on the Sunday before the holidays it was customary to subscribe for the singing of a special psalm popularly known as 'Hailstones,' which was wedded to an intensely florid tune, and was performed at afternoon service by a choir who scarcely on any other occasion darkened the church doors. Some years within the period embraced in Dr. Atkinson's volume the curate of a Suffolk village was startled by several men shouting 'Hallelujah!' from the moment he appeared at the vestry door until he was ready to commence the service, and the strain was renewed as soon as he had pronounced the blessing, and continued until his form was lost to sight. Upon enquiry they explained that in the absence of an organ they were filling up the 'vacancy.' Every variety of instrument, from the pitch pipe to the trombone, was pressed into service. In one place the clerk walked from his place below the reading-desk and mounted the gallery there to lead the choir. In another a body of men stepped out from their seats to gather round music-stands in the central aisle. In a third an old man carried a flute and a violoncello into the singing-pew, and having fairly started the singing with his flute, would change it for his bow to 'throw in a bass,' and then suddenly and deftly resume the flute again if he thought the singers showed any sign of flagging. And oh! the anthems of those bygone days! The singers went before and the minstrels followed after with an independence of each other of which the psalmist never dreamed.

Amongst the miscellaneous items of the forty years are some very vivid descriptions of winter scenery, whose glorious beauties would be more than counterbalanced to most minds by such dangers of snowdrift and being cut off from the world as Dr. Atkinson experienced. So keen a sportsman and observer would naturally take interest in the ornithology of the district, and in speaking of it the author is led to narrate the stratagems adopted by poachers in imitating the cry of birds in order to lure them into their nets. Of his own experience with such artificial decoys Dr. Atkinson tells the following story:—

'One day, some twenty or twenty-five years ago, I had arranged with one of the principal yeomen here to go with him to Glaisdale-

Swangs—a wet, morassy division of the Danby and Glaisdale high moors—our object being to get, if we could, a few couples of golden plover. I had for long practised the imitation of the cry uttered by the golden plover, especially when they are on the ground; and I flattered myself I could do it rather well—as, indeed, I think I could. . . . After two or three stray shots as we walked together we separated, to take our own private chances of a passing flight or a few stray birds still about the ground, and either stalking or calling any of whose comparative vicinity we might become aware. I do not think either of us was remarkably successful, and I was beginning to think that our bag would be light. Suddenly I heard the call of a plover, and under what seemed to be the most favourable circumstances. The moor rose from where I was standing with a gradual slope, but little broken, for the third part of a mile or more, and the call came from the upper part of the ridge, but quite evidently from some little distance on the other side of it. I replied to the call, and to my delight there was an almost immediate answer. A minute or so elapsed, during which I was cautiously approaching the point from over which the cry seemed to come, and I called again. Another response, and evidently the bird had been drawing nearer to me, as I had been drawing nearer to it. The same interchange of call and reply continued at intervals of a half-minute or so, and for a sufficiently long space to enable me to have got within forty or fifty yards of the ridge. I was crouching as low as possible all the latter part of the ascent, and I made sure that on rising from my stooping attitude, and making a quick rush to the ridge, I should have a shot within very easy distance. The call from the other side came just then, and my reply was the best spurt I could make with my gun at the ready. I had not covered two yards when I saw my companion's hat, and a second later his gun, at the ready also. He had been answering my calls as regularly as I addressed them to the supposed plover. I need hardly say that the only explosion which took place was a united one of rather shamefaced but very hearty laughter at our mutual discomfiture' (pp. 339-41).

Enough has been said to show how varied are the contents of this record of forty years, and yet there are whole sections, and those not the least interesting, which we have been constrained to pass unnoticed. Dr. Atkinson is never content to take a merely cursory or superficial view of any question, and he carries out some of his inquiries at a length to which some readers can hardly follow him in these days of hurry and great pressure of work. His motto clearly is that whatever is worth doing at all is worth doing well, and so he pursues his subject exhaustively, whether it be local geology, pre-Domesday glances, or research into the vexed question of enclosure of common lands. On each and all of these topics there is much interesting matter in copious appendices. As we cast our thoughts over the past this volume presents to

us the question rises spontaneously, Are we better than our fathers? Yet we doubt whether we have the data on which to found a righteous judgment. We have a thousand advantages these dalesmen never knew, and with them corresponding responsibility which never will be laid to their charge. Dr. Atkinson modestly enough claims that some progress has been made, and the impartial reader will find abundant grounds for acquiescence in so satisfactory a conclusion.

---

#### ART. X.—SOME MODERN SERMONS.

1. *Village Sermons preached at Whatley.* By the late R. W. CHURCH, some time Dean of St. Paul's, Rector of Whatley, Fellow of Oriel College. (London, 1892.)
2. *Life in the Catholic Church: its Blessings and Responsibilities.* By R. W. RANDALL, Vicar of All Saints', Clifton. (London, 1889.)
3. *Old Truths in Modern Lights.* The Boyle Lectures for 1890, with other Sermons. By T. G. BONNEY, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, &c. (London, 1891.)
4. *Christian Doctrines and Modern Thought.* The Boyle Lectures for 1891. By T. G. BONNEY. (London, 1892.)
5. New and Collected Edition of the *Sermons*, &c. of Archdeacon FARRAR, in Eleven Volumes—monthly, from December, 1891. (London, 1891-2).
6. *Social and Present-Day Questions.* By F. W. FARRAR, Archdeacon of Westminster, &c. (London, 1892.)
7. *Cathedral and University Sermons.* By C. P. REICHEL, Bishop of Meath. (London, 1891.)
8. *The Cessation of Prophecy, and other Sermons.* By the late W. H. SIMCOX. (London, 1891.)

IN a recent number of this Review a doubt was expressed as to the justice of the common complaint about the degeneracy of the pulpit. The volumes of sermons which then came under review did not seem to bear out the theory; and those now before us point so distinctly to the same conclusion that we purpose making them the basis of some more lengthened remarks on the subject. We have here specimens of several styles of sermons: they come from different schools of thought in the Church; they are intended for different sorts of hearers—some for town, some for village congregations; some for

univ  
the  
we  
or i  
foll  
the  
the  
late  
that  
serm  
note  
popu  
of ab  
the n  
not  
of C  
great  
Puse  
Ther  
Chur  
occa  
was  
Fello  
time  
Whe  
calib  
Sund  
we c  
he w  
defin  
on s  
mind  
they  
both  
are w  
But  
affect  
offen  
to ri  
perha  
as a  
such  
his si  
more  
comp



university, some for cathedral pulpits ; we differ widely from the sentiments expressed in some of them ; but in none can we find any traces of degeneracy, either in intellectual power or in moral earnestness ; and we venture to think that if the following remarks call the attention of any candid reader to the sermons themselves, he will come to the same conclusion.

For more reasons than one the *Village Sermons* of the late Dean of St. Paul's claim the first place. The mere fact that such a man as R. W. Church should be preaching village sermons at all for the space of nearly twenty years is itself noteworthy. In a remote village in Somersetshire, with a population of little more than two hundred, and an income of about the same amount, lay buried for all that time one of the most refined and cultured minds in England. And it was not as if he were an unknown man. He had been a Fellow of Oriel, and was recognized as being fully worthy of the great traditions which lingered about the college of Newman, Pusey, Keble, Arnold, Whately, Davison, and Copleston. There were giants in the land in those days ; and in R. W. Church there was a survival of the race. On one memorable occasion he had stood in the breach ; and when all Oxford was running wild with excitement had shown that one young Fellow of Oriel, who happened to be Junior Proctor at the time, kept his head and had the courage of his opinions. Whether the simple rustics at Whatley knew what was the calibre of the man who was preaching to them Sunday after Sunday in the simplest of simple fashions, from 1853 to 1871, we cannot tell. Probably they had a vague sort of idea that he was no common man, though they might not be able to define precisely why ; for country folks have keen perceptions on such points—keener, perhaps, than their more active-minded town neighbours give them credit for. At any rate, they could not complain that he was 'too high-larnt ;' for both the matter and the diction of these exquisite sermons are within the compass of the most unlettered congregation. But while there is no parade of learning, there is also no affectation of simplicity, which is quite as pedantic and more offensive, but which those who have to condescend rather than to rise to an occasion are sometimes apt, unconsciously perhaps, to show. Dr. Church writes quite naturally, using, as a good man would wish to do, such plain language and such obvious arguments as would not fly above the heads of his simple hearers. But the more cultured a reader is, the more clearly will he perceive that these sermons are the composition of a highly trained intellect. There are traces

all through them of the art that conceals art. It might seem at the first glance that what the preacher said or the writer wrote, any one might say or write ; but a closer study shows the scholar and the divine in every page, nay, in every sentence. The gem of the volume, not because it is better composed, but because there is a touching autobiographical interest about it, is the 'Farewell Sermon' at the close ; and as it is a fair specimen both of the writer's style and also of the way in which he regarded his humble work, a short extract will not, it is hoped, be unacceptable :

'To-day is a day when those who have long lived together, and worked together, and learned to know one another, come to the parting of the roads. We can no longer travel together ; we must go, you to one path, I to the other. To-day is a day which finishes and winds up a large piece in all our lives who have been together so long ; finishes all that I have been to you and you to me. It is not, indeed, that we shall not see one another's faces again ; it is not that, I hope. But this is the last time that I shall speak to you as your clergyman ; the last time that you meet to worship with me as my parishioners. A great gap is going to open between you and me for evermore in this world.

'We have been together a long time, as we count time here—nearly nineteen years. Those who were the old people when I came are mostly gone. Those who were the middle-aged are become old. The children whom I first baptized, and taught in school, and prepared for confirmation, are now men and women, dispersed, many of them, from the homes where they were born to new ones ; some to the ends of the earth. We have lived together in eventful times ; the most eventful times which this century has yet seen, even though it began with the great French war, which closed at Waterloo.'

Then follows a brief sketch, drawn, as Dr. Church knew so well how to draw it, of the great national events that had taken place between 1853 and 1871 ; and then he goes on :

'But these are not the things which are in our remembrance now. In our perfect quiet we yet have had our own changes. We have had much to interest us, to stir and touch our hearts. And in the eyes of Him who counts the hairs of our head, our interests and our changes are of weight ; they have been marked and recorded. My thoughts, and I am sure yours also, go back to many solemn and many joyful days ; to festivals and weddings and christenings and funerals ; to many a happy Christmas and Christmas Eve, with the lighted church and the holly-leaves, in the dark winter night ; to many a glad and peaceful Easter ; to many a summer school feast ; to many a blessed communion together' (pp. 309-10).

Space forbids us to quote the excellent advice which follows—advice which any clergyman would naturally give on

such  
Dr. C.  
another  
half-c  
when  
with  
about  
heard  
with  
logian  
appre  
simpl  
one o  
to som  
ing h  
Edwa  
great  
turne  
educ  
De  
from  
the th  
Of co  
point  
Dean  
preter  
everyt  
ing hi  
are no  
Randa  
they v  
Sixtee  
tions,  
by the  
althou  
on Ch  
in his  
The g  
bines  
be mis  
should  
on the  
could  
sents  
find fa  
VOL.

such an occasion, though hardly in such beautiful language as Dr. Church uses; but before we leave this fascinating volume another remark must be made. One can quite conceive a half-educated person dropping casually into Whatley church when one of these sermons was preached, and coming away with a feeling of disappointment, and with his impressions about the decay of modern preaching confirmed. He has heard nothing to arouse excitement, nothing to impress him with the conviction that the preacher is a deeply read theologian or a born orator. It requires a higher culture to appreciate the refinement of mind which underlies all this simple teaching. Grotesque as it may sound, the sermons of one of the very greatest of our modern writers might certainly to some ears bear out the popular notion that modern preaching has degenerated, just as in the seventeenth century Edward Pocock, whose European reputation for learning was greater than that of any living Englishman, was all but turned out of the country living of Childrey by the half-educated Puritans 'for ignorance and insufficiency.'

Dean Randall's *Life in the Catholic Church* differs widely from Dean Church's *Village Sermons*, but it equally bears out the theory that good preaching is not a thing of the past. Of course it would be absurd to compare the two volumes in point of composition. We are quite sure that the present Dean of Chichester would himself be the first to disclaim any pretensions to that exquisite literary finish which distinguishes everything that the late Dean of St. Paul's wrote, not excluding his simple *Village Sermons*. But, on the other hand, we are not at all sure whether such sermons as those of Dean Randall would not be more effective for the purpose for which they were intended than Dean Church's would have been. Sixteen out of the twenty were preached to town congregations, who would perhaps have considered themselves insulted by the bare simplicity of the Dean of St. Paul's. Moreover, although Dr. Church as a good Churchman of course writes on Church lines, he is by no means so marked and definite in his enunciation of Church principles as Dr. Randall is. The great merit of the latter appears to us to be that he combines the utmost outspokenness—the drift of which cannot be mistaken—with a tenderness and Christian charity which should go far to disarm the hostile criticism which his views on the Church and the sects could not fail to evoke. We could fancy Low Churchmen, Broad Churchmen, and Dissenters (if they had any taste) admiring, and seeing little to find fault with in, Dean Church; but no one except an Anglo-

VOL. XXXIV.—NO. LXVIII.

II

Catholic could read Dean Randall without finding something with which he would disagree. The sacramental system is the pivot on which all his sermons turn, and he never loses sight of it for a moment. Being strong in his convictions, and absolutely certain that the system is right, he can afford to be generous—and he is. A notable instance may be found in the sermon entitled, 'Love for the Faithful the Consequence of Feeding on Christ.' Nowhere is his Church teaching more definite and outspoken, and nowhere does he lay down more clearly the rules of true Christian charity. Witness the following passage, which deserves to be written in letters of gold:

'Our love is to be like His own, broad, tender, gentle, forgiving, healing, soothing, blessing all around. And here, then, is a noble work set before us, to remove all barriers that keep heart from heart. Let us, then, aim at this:

'1. Keep up in your minds the sense of inward communion with others. Realize this. Love, respect, honour the life of Christ in others.

'2. Pray for the power to understand others better; for deeper, true [*sic*; query 'truer'], heartier sympathy with them.

'3. Extend the range of your intercessions.

'4. Cultivate the spirit of fellowship by acts of loving kindness. Take your part in the sorrows and joys of others. "Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep."

'5. Put the best possible construction on the acts and words of others.

'6. Avoid on your own part what is likely to be misunderstood.

'7. If you have to speak on matters of faith, recommend the truth by stating it in the form likeliest to ensure its reception.

'8. If you have to deal with those who are in error, look for the truth that underlies this error.

'9. Avoid on your own part the error which springs from the exaggeration of truth.

'10. Most of all, honour the life of Jesus Christ within yourself. His was a life of unbounded love, of tenderness, forbearance, long-suffering, gentleness,' &c. (pp. 183-4).

Dean Randall does not preach to others what he does not practise in his own preaching. It is dangerous to assert a negative; but we can truly say that we have not come across a single passage in the whole volume which can be fairly said to transgress any of these golden rules. The whole tenor of the book will, of course, be distasteful to Low Churchmen and no-Churchmen; but, however they may dislike the writer's sentiments, they must admit that he expresses them in the spirit of a Christian and a gentleman.

He is never abusive, and always seems to look on his opponents 'more in sorrow than in anger'—sorrow that they should cut themselves off from privileges that would be an inestimable blessing to themselves, rather than anger that they should differ in opinion from *him*.

In this respect there is a marked and curious contrast between the tone of the stiff and uncompromising High Churchman who is credited by the outer world with illiberality and intolerance, and that of some who would pride themselves on their tolerance and liberality. Let us take two series of Boyle Lectures, the one for 1890 and the other for 1891, both written by Dr. Bonney, a man of mark, a Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and examining chaplain to the Bishop of Manchester. In point of intellectual power both these volumes of sermons bear out the contention that there is no decay in modern preaching; but in point of Christian charity towards a vast and increasing number of his brother-clergy, many of whom are at least as distinguished theologians as himself, Dr. Bonney is sadly lacking. It is not pretty language to call a brother-clergyman, even though he be a High Churchman, a 'shaman, or wizard priest' (p. 127). 'The question,' he writes in the same sermon, 'which lies really at the root of all controversies [about the sacraments], may be stated bluntly—perhaps, to the minds of some, even offensively—in these words, Are they in any way magic rites?'<sup>1</sup> As he appears to mean by 'magic rites' rites which convey a spiritual blessing, we must confess to being of the number of those who *would* regard the statement as 'offensive'—offensive, not to ourselves, but to a Higher One. Nor can we apply a milder epithet to what he says about the Church and Church authority:

'Sometimes it means a decision of a small local council in bygone ages; not seldom that of a little coterie at the present day; sometimes it means the opinion of an ancient author, more conspicuous for zeal than for learning; not seldom that of the editor of a partisan journal, who has no more right to represent even the Church of England than I have to speak for her Majesty's ministers.'<sup>2</sup>

Is the 'small local council in bygone ages' the council held at Nicæa, or Ephesus, or Chalcedon, or Constantinople, or what? It would have been more satisfactory if Dr. Bonney had given us the name. Is the 'ancient author' Athanasius, or Cyprian, or Jerome, or Chrysostom, or who? Is there 'a

<sup>1</sup> *Christian Doctrines and Modern Thought*, p. 131.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 150.

little coterie' or 'a partisan journal,' professing to represent 'even the Church of England,' which ventures to speak on its own authority, and not on what it conceives to be the universal voice of antiquity? Again, can it be otherwise than offensive to High Churchmen to hear their principles described as 'a revival of ecclesiastical pretensions and a recrudescence of superstition?'<sup>1</sup> Or to hear theologians *versus* scientists thus sweepingly condemned?—'Doubtless they are largely to blame for the origin of the conflict: their efforts to subjugate the reason and tyrannize over the intellect have often deserved the severest censure; they have sometimes gone near to making Christianity a curse instead of a blessing.'<sup>2</sup> 'That misuse of theology which, for want of a better name, may be called ecclesiasticism,' 'the mischief wrought by presumptuous ignorance and sacerdotal arrogance,'<sup>3</sup>—are these, to which many more of the like nature might be added, *inoffensive* expressions? It would lead us too far afield if we attempted to enter into the questions between 'ecclesiasticism,' or, as we should prefer to call it, 'the Church,' and her antagonists. But one thing certainly does puzzle us. The Boyle Lectures were instituted 'for proving the Christian religion against notorious Infidels,' and to enjoin the clergy 'to be assisting to all companies and encouraging of them in any undertaking for the propagating of the Christian religion to foreign parts.' Was it quite within the intention of the pious layman who founded these lectures that they should be made the vehicle for pouring contempt upon a body of clergy who, whatever else they may be, are at any rate on the side of 'the Christian religion against notorious Infidels,' and are not unmindful of the duty of 'propagating the Christian religion to foreign parts'?

The same defect mars some of the sermons of another preacher, whom in many respects we confess that we admire, though it is to be feared that he does not return the compliment by admiring us. A new edition in ten or eleven volumes of Archdeacon Farrar's *Sermons*, &c., together with a new book entitled *Social and Present-Day Questions*, which is to all intents and purposes a volume of sermons, leads us to say a word about one who is in some quarters the best abused, and in others the most admired, preacher in England. Dr. Farrar seems to us to have many of the elements of an excellent preacher. To say nothing of his presence and delivery, his style and matter and extremely florid language

<sup>1</sup> *Old Truths in Modern Lights*, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 19.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 9.

are  
bloo  
every  
thoro  
giving  
eloqu  
litera  
other  
by a  
deter  
this  
repre  
little  
the v  
his l  
Chri  
with  
Eter  
and  
'Are  
can l  
or so  
whos  
We a  
expr  
and  
'rub  
eccle  
idlen  
clerie  
balef  
much  
Dr.  
'orth  
—up  
'orth  
to ha  
seem  
being  
quac  
V  
differ  
poin  
mod  
Reic



are more adapted for the pulpit than for reading in cold blood. His earnestness and boldness in attacking evil in every form, his obvious sincerity and lack of self-seeking, his thorough outspokenness which makes him careless about giving any amount of offence, his real if somewhat stilted eloquence, his wide acquaintance with and dexterous use of literature of all kinds, poetry as well as prose—these and many other qualifications of a great preacher will hardly be denied by any unprejudiced person. But, on the other hand, we detect in him a growing intolerance of what most readers of this review will regard as the school which most faithfully represents the teaching of Scripture and antiquity. We find little of it in the Marlborough sermons (1871-6), reprinted in the volume entitled *In the Days of Thy Youth*, little of it in his Hulsean Lectures of 1871, *The Witness of History to Christ*, where he brings his wide historical knowledge to bear with great effect upon Christianity. But in his *Gospel of Eternal Hope* (1878), and still more in his latest volume, *Social and Present-Day Questions* (1891), it is very conspicuous. 'Are you tolerant?' he asks in this work: 'Doubtless you can be sweet as summer to those of your own sect or clique, or school of thought. . . . But have you any charity for those whose views are entirely different from your own?' (p. 50). We are rather tempted to retort, 'Are you tolerant?' Such expressions, scattered broadcast, as 'our elaborate theologies, and our routine ceremonies, and our professional fineries,' 'rubrics and millinery and stereotyped services,' 'our petty ecclesiastical jealousies,' 'outward function and strenuous idleness,' 'the finicking pettinesses of ritual,' 'effeminate clericalism and professional conventionality,' 'the glaring and baleful reaction of anathematizing orthodoxy,' do not look much like it. There are two words which seem to act upon Dr. Farrar as a red rag does upon a bull, 'dogma' and 'orthodoxy.' But Dr. Farrar prides himself—and with justice—upon his Greek scholarship. May we remind him that 'orthodoxy' merely means 'right opinion': does he desire us to have wrong opinions? 'Dogma' merely means what has seemed good to competent authority, the 'dogmatic physician' being the properly trained one, as opposed to the empiric or quack. Does he desire us to be all spiritual quacks?

We turn from Archdeacon Farrar to a preacher of a very different type, but one who in his way equally confirms our point, that the virtue has not all gone out of sermons in these modern days. The *Cathedral and University Sermons* of Dr. Reichel, Bishop of Meath, are certainly not unworthy of

pulpits from which one would naturally expect light and leading. The difference between Dr. Farrar and Dr. Reichel may be broadly stated as the difference between rhetoric and logic. With great perspicacity both of thought and language—the two generally go together—the Bishop of Meath argues out a subject thoroughly, ‘boults the matter to the bran,’ boldly faces all difficulties, and rarely leaves them unsolved. His sermon on the efficacy of prayer is a notable instance. His arguments on the subject appear to us unanswerable, and we are inclined to say ‘O si sic omnia.’ For we are bound to add that we cannot agree with him in all his sermons; those, for example, on the limits of Christ’s knowledge and on confession seem to us to require many qualifications. But this only brings out the more strongly a quality which he possesses in common with Dr. Farrar, and which is totally at variance with the common complaint against modern preachers—that they do not speak out with sufficient boldness and independence. Both the Bishop and the Archdeacon are bold and independent almost to a fault. The former especially might describe himself with perfect truth as ‘Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri.’ He hits out vehemently against High Churchmen in his diatribes against habitual confession; but he fights their battle manfully in his outspoken utterances on the nature of the Church. These last occur in a sermon preached at St. Patrick’s Cathedral, Dublin, on Whitsunday, from which it would appear that in Ireland Whitsunday is not so fully recognized as it ought to be as a great festival of the Church. We in England should scarcely have thought that this was the case; but the Bishop of Meath, no doubt, knows Ireland better than we do. One of the reasons he gives for the comparative neglect of this high feast is ‘the little value in which men hold the Church, whose inauguration it celebrates.’ Then follows a passage which reminds us of the famous letters of William Law to the Bishop of Bangor, and which is worth quoting both for its intrinsic excellence and as a specimen of our preacher’s style.

‘We have shaken off this exorbitant respect for ecclesiastical authority; perhaps we have come to feel no respect whatever for it. When you read the words used by St. Paul in the Epistle to the Ephesians concerning the Church, when you hear him say that by or in it is disclosed “the multifarious wisdom of God,” that it is “the body of Christ, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all,” do you ever dream of applying this language to what is now called “the visible Church”? Will you not feel surprised when I tell you that,

after  
Apost  
of “th  
such  
person  
a soci

V  
villag  
can  
one  
theol  
terril  
in po  
short  
an o  
and  
first,  
to t  
befo  
one  
at C  
adap  
in t  
reas  
here  
peri  
whic  
men  
wou  
case  
poi  
we  
say  
wer  
imp

TH  
tha  
Int  
in

after carefully reading St. Paul's Epistles, I am satisfied that that Apostle never conceived the idea which we present under the name of "the invisible Church" on earth? That, by the Church of which such glorious things are spoken, he meant simply the body of persons professing to believe in Christ, and who were organized into a society that could be seen and known of all men?' (pp. 195-6).

We end, as we began, with a volume of sermons for a village congregation, against which the only complaint that can be made is the title. The *Cessation of Prophecy* gives one the idea of something abstruse, and to the student of the theology of the early part of the present century it awakens terrible recollections of profound subjects feebly treated. But in point of fact the volume before us is simply a collection of short, practical sermons, intended and admirably adapted for an ordinary congregation, whether of townsmen or villagers; and the 'Cessation of Prophecy' is merely the title of the first, which deals most appropriately with a subject suitable to the occasion on which it was preached, the Sunday next before Advent. The preacher, the late W. H. Simcox, was one who, like Dean Church, had highly distinguished himself at Oxford, and, like the Dean, had thoroughly learnt how to adapt himself to the simple villagers to whom all the sermons in the volume were preached. It would indeed be an unreasonably fastidious person who would complain of the food here provided for him. And this certainly has been our experience in the majority both of town and village churches which we have attended. Good preaching is, in our judgment, far more common than good reading—or perhaps it would be more correct to say good sermons; for in most cases the weak point of the sermon, if there *was* a weak point, was in the delivery rather than the matter. Whether we have been exceptionally fortunate we cannot of course say; but the batch of sermons which have formed, as it were, the text for this article certainly confirms the favourable impression we have derived as 'hearers of the Word.'

---

### SHORT NOTICES.

*Expositor* for June 1892. (London: Hodder and Stoughton.)

THE only portion of this periodical which we propose to notice is that which contains Professor Driver's answer to the criticisms of his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, which appeared in our January number. That answer is in some ways a remarkable

one. To certain points of our indictment it will be seen he pleads guilty, sheltering himself, however, under the plea that space forbade him to give his reasons for the opinions he had formed. On all the graver points of the indictment he allows judgment against him to go by default. But he endeavours to avoid summary conviction by riding off on a side issue. The main article of our accusation was that while the Professor asserts his treatment of the Books of Moses to be in accordance with the 'canons of evidence and probability universally employed in historical or literary investigation,' in point of fact the very contrary is the case. His methods, we contended, are those originally invented to support foregone conclusions in regard to the authorship and date of the Mosaic books. So far as they have been employed in other fields of investigation they are not merely discredited, but exploded. And even in the case of the New Testament their attempt to account for the phenomena has been a conspicuous failure. We further argued that the researches instituted to discover the substratum of fact underlying a vast mass of tradition and legend are entirely valueless when used for an exactly opposite purpose. The kind of critical investigation which might have some claim on our attention when searching for a *Grundchrift* is entirely useless in the attempt to determine the contents of a supplement. The very characteristics of which you are in search, in your endeavour to ascertain the original form of the narrative, the baldness, dryness, want of imagination and ornament, are precisely those you would not expect to find in the work of a later age. It were as reasonable to believe the Saxon Chronicle to have been written in the reign of Queen Victoria as to transpose the *Grundchrift* of the older critics bodily to the period after the return from the captivity. Moreover Professor Driver and those who think with him have never attempted to explain why the post-exilic Redactor should insert so many citations from an almost contemporary author when he had the far fuller, more picturesque, more elegant, and more authoritative narratives of J. and E. before him.

To these arguments—not, we venture to think, utterly beneath the notice of a candid critic—Professor Driver makes no reply. We moreover put forward some considerations in the direction of the particular line of study on which Professor Driver's attention has been mainly concentrated. These, also, he has passed by without notice. But he has an answer for us, which he evidently deems most crushing and conclusive. We know nothing of Klostermann. That, one would think, in an inquiry on a subject such as that on which Professor Driver writes, were a matter almost entirely beside the mark. It is not as though we stood committed to any theory of Klostermann's. We did, indeed, say that he seemed possessed of a sense of humour likely to preserve him from some of the strange absurdities into which even Professor Driver occasionally falls.<sup>1</sup> We quoted with approval his protest against the dogmatism of some of his brother German critics. We further remarked that to abuse Professor Klostermann was not

<sup>1</sup> E.g. *Introduction*, pp. 8, 15.

to answer Chey's comments Quixot but a notion so to have Into the what P. brethren what h answer the sub of that been la very fa Testam

Pro criticism our ap imposs idea of have el to have the pas out ha edition opinion for whi of conc from th *Introduc* of the much words self, th majori even to tation, older s books plain h the pa they an

The the stre between

<sup>1</sup> E ment o demon

to answer him, and we not unnaturally inferred that as Professor Cheyne preferred abuse to argument he had very probably no arguments to offer. Certainly to call Professor Klostermann 'the Don Quixote of criticism,' and to inform us that Professor Driver had but a mean opinion of him, is only to adopt the form of demonstration so happily satirized in *The Tale of a Tub*. We are glad to have elicited from Professor Driver some reply to his antagonist. Into the merits of that reply we need not enter until we have seen what Professor Klostermann has to say on the subject. His English brethren have doubtless seen fit ere this to apprise him of the somewhat bitter attacks they have made on him. We shall await his answer with some curiosity. But for ourselves we are interested in the subject only so far as it throws light upon the nature and extent of that agreement among the critics on which so much stress has been laid, and as it illustrates our contention that criticism is as yet very far from having said its last word on the question of the Old Testament.

Professor Driver has done us the honour to refer to two other criticisms we made, each of a linguistic character. We tender him our apologies for having overlooked his note on p. 80. But it was impossible from so brief an allusion as we find there to gain the least idea of the purport of the article to which he refers us. We are glad to have elicited some proof of statements which we still think ought not to have been put forward unsupported by argument, and we trust that the passage to which he refers as having been in print four years without having been published will find a place as a note in some future edition of the *Introduction*. Moreover we must still maintain our opinion that the failure to comply with the 'strict inductive method,' for which the Professor apologizes in p. xi of his Preface as the result of conditions imposed upon him from without, detracts very seriously from the value of his work. As we pointed out in our review of the *Introduction*, nothing is likely to be so fatal to the general acceptance of the modern criticism of the Old Testament as the fact that so much of it depends upon mere assertion. Professor Driver's own words in regard to Klostermann may not unfairly be applied to himself, that of his arguments 'very few indeed are cogent, and the majority rest upon nothing but conjecture.'<sup>1</sup> It is scarcely open, even to a Hebrew scholar of Professor Driver's acknowledged reputation, to dismiss with a wave of the hand all the conclusions of the older scholars in regard to the comparative antiquity of the various books of the Bible. We are glad that he has condescended to explain himself, though even now he has by no means proved that in the passages where the peculiar forms to which we referred occur they are not to be regarded as poetic archaisms.

The truth is, as we have before remarked, that argument is not the strong point of the new criticism. There is a singular resemblance between its logic and that employed by the Roman Catholic Church.

<sup>1</sup> *Expositor*, p. 328. Except, of course, those which rest on the agreement of the 'critics,' a basis which falls many degrees short of actual demonstration.

Each rests its case upon pure assumption. Each demands submission to authority. Excommunication is freely resorted to by each, for the critics who presume to criticize the critics are declared to be outside the pale of the critical Church. Historical investigation, at least on ordinary lines, is worse than useless. In the one case a Council, in the other a certain school of criticism, is the authority to which all must bow. The one looks to Rome, the other to Germany, for the final verdict. But England, in all probability, will turn as deaf an ear to critical as she has to Papal infallibility. 'The last *fad* of a German Professor,' to borrow a phrase from the Duke of Argyll, will hardly compel the submission of the British people. We would in conclusion call Professor Driver's attention to two quotations taken from the works of men each of whom is regarded as an authority in his own particular sphere. Bishop Westcott writes: 'If the Bible were only a collection of ancient writings its readers would have a right to claim that those who deal with it should be conversant with the laws of literary criticism and the methods of historical inquiry.'<sup>1</sup> And Professor Henry Morley, writing about Müllenhoff's theory of the well-known poem of our Anglo-Saxon forefathers, the story of Beowulf, writes as follows in words which, *mutatis mutandis*, may be applied to the German theory of the Priestly Code.

'Müllenhoff is the author of the boldest attempt at a literary criticism that shall resolve the authorship of the work into various constituent elements. There is a delusive air of accuracy in this kind of criticism that has helped to bring it into favour. Courage is all that is wanted to make anyone great as an analyst in the new speculative chemistry applied to books. There are two separate main stories in Beowulf . . . the fight with Grendel, and the dragon. Say then they were originally separate. That is a first piece of discrimination. In the Grendel story there are two parts . . . say that they were originally separate. That is a second piece of discrimination. Now look to the poem, and fix lines of demarcation. The first old song, say of the fight with Grendel, extends from l. 194 to 836—call that I. Somebody added to I. lines 837-1628, the second old song. Call that II. As the introduction is not part of the direct story of Grendel, and now lies outside the analysis, say that somebody added that. As there is connecting matter between the Grendel story (I.) and the Dragon story (II.), ascribe that to somebody else, and call him Reviser A. Say that he put poetical touches to the whole. . . . *Ascribe to him conspicuous little passages here and there, always knowing precisely to a line or word where a touch of Interpolator A is to be found* [the italics throughout are ours], since nobody has any direct evidence to prove you wrong. There remains then the Dragon story (II.). Give this to another man, whom you call Interpolator B. He *revises everything that has been done before, is the monk who puts in the Christian touches*, edits the whole vigorously (show exactly where and how; never doubt that you know all about it), and introduces the little historical episodes. This describes exactly enough the theory of Karl Müllenhoff, one of the ablest . . . and may serve as a key to the last new method of criticism in our earlier literature. The method is not itself so exceptionable as the delusive air of exactness with which it is applied. This gives to mere guesses an air of positiveness unfavourable

<sup>1</sup> *Bible in the Church*, Preface, p. x.

to the  
bounda

Suc  
cism in  
may be  
the sar

Missai

H  
F

In the  
when I  
Bishop  
ton, pr  
altar o

It  
and of  
fessor.

Th  
means  
its mar  
posse  
before  
becom  
three-a  
of the  
identif  
Museum  
Dean a

Dr.  
spoken  
(vol. 1  
Society  
entire  
octaves  
versary  
The de  
was at  
work u  
tober 1

In  
of the  
anniver  
ing ser  
first of  
Wilson  
publish

<sup>1</sup> Pr  
<sup>2</sup> Br  
in one



to the growth of that sound critical judgment which *never forgets the boundaries between known, probable, and possible.*<sup>1</sup>

Such is the verdict of a competent English critic on the new criticism in the department of English literature. Such, Professor Driver may be well assured, will be the ultimate verdict of Englishmen on the same criticism when applied to Holy Scripture.

*Missale ad Usum Ecclesie Westmonasteriensis.* Edited by J. WICKHAM LEGG for the Henry Bradshaw Liturgical Text Society. Fasc. I. (London: Harrison and Sons, 1891.)

IN the latter half of the fourteenth century (about the time, that is, when Richard II. was King of England and William of Wykeham Bishop of Winchester) the Abbot of Westminster, Nicholas Lytlington, presented to his abbey a noble Missal worthy for use on the high altar of that royal church.

It was furnished with the coronation service and with a kalendar and offices suited for the great foundation of King Edward the Confessor.

Though the Abbey, which lost by fire in 1694, is not by any means the most rich among our English churches in the number of its manuscripts, the Dean and Chapter are fortunate in being still the possessors of so fine a liturgical manuscript of their own Use as this before us, when divers such books have escaped destruction only to become the treasure of some library far from their proper home. Of three-and-twenty liturgical books recorded as belonging to the vestry of the Abbey in an inventory of 1388, two only appear to have been identified as still extant in 1890—namely, a Psalter now in the British Museum<sup>2</sup> and Abbot Lytlington's Missal, still in the custody of the Dean and Chapter.

Dr. Legg, who has edited the inventory of which we have just spoken with careful and learned notes in the London *Archæologia* (vol. lii.), has now given to the Henry Bradshaw Liturgical Text Society the text of the kalendar, the making of holy water, and the entire *Temporale*, from Advent to the twenty-fifth Sunday after the octaves of Pentecost inclusive, together with the service for the anniversary of the *dedicatio ecclesie*—from the munificent Abbot's Missal. The dedication of the Abbey itself, though not noted in the kalendar, was at Childermas, just after the death of the Confessor, and the new work under King Henry III. was first used by the monks on October 13, 1269, when the saint's body was translated.

In order to get some idea of the liturgical character of the text of the Westminster Mass-book, we will take the service provided in *anniversario dedicationis ecclesie* and compare it with the corresponding service in some of the other rites which are before us. To speak first of what for convenience we may class as 'collects' (as Mr. H. A. Wilson does in his welcome *Index to Roman Sacramentaries*, recently published by the Cambridge Press), the Westminster book contains

<sup>1</sup> Professor Henry Morley's *English Writers*, i. 347.

<sup>2</sup> Brit. Mus. 2, A, xvii., or 2, A, xxii., for there is obviously a misprint in one or other of the printed authorities before us.

*Oratio*, *Secretum*, and *Postcommunio*, answering to the *Collecta*, *Secreta*, and *Postcommunio* of the Mass in *anniversarium ecclesie* of the Leofric Missal (tenth and eleventh century portion C), and likewise to the *oratio*, *super oblata*, and additional or alternative *super oblata* of the service in *anniversario dedicationis basilicæ* of the ninth century Gregorian Sacramentary edited by Menard. The first and second of these are identical in these three books (excepting where Leofric reads 'uenire' for 'pervenire'). The Sarum, York, and Hereford Missals also retain these prayers. So also does the post-Pian Roman *Missale*, with only a verbal inversion, made for the sake, perhaps, of euphony. But this order of words, 'dum hæc vota præsentia,' was not newly made at the period of the Council of Trent, for it is found (e.g.) in a Benedictine Missal—Giunta, 1515.

The Westminster *postcommunio* is 'Deus qui ecclesiam tuam sponsam,' &c. This differs entirely from the Roman and the Benedictine (which have 'Deus qui de vivis et electis'), but it is found with some variations in the English printed Uses. Sarum has a shorter version of the prayer than York and Hereford, which are nearer to Westminster. But Westminster here agrees more closely still with Leofric and with the ninth-century Gregorian. But the Westminster scribe is apparently alone with Sarum in addressing the *Postcommunio ad Filium* with a 'Qui uiuis.'

Turning to the Scriptural portion of this Mass, we are struck by a peculiarity in the introit, which is given thus: '*Off.* Terribilis est (Gen. xxviii. 17, 19). *Ps.* Surgens autem (i.e. Gen. xxviii. 18). *Off.* Terribilis. *Ps.* Quam dilecta.' Here Sarum has, '*Off.* Terribilis. *Ps.* Dominus regnavit, decorem.' Rome and York have with Congr. Casinensis; '*Off.* Terribilis. *Ps.* Quam dilecta.' Dr. Legg points out the peculiarity in Westm. in calling the passage from Genesis a *psalm*. To this we may find a familiar parallel in our phrase, 'Here endeth the Epistle,' as applied to a passage from the prophetic books. But it is interesting to observe that the Hereford Missal here agrees more closely with Westminster than the rest, giving '*Off.* Terribilis. *Psalmus.* Surgens.'

The Westminster book has the tractus 'Quam dilecta' and the sequence of Adam of St. Victor 'Jerusalem et Syon filia' (vulg. *filie*). This, of course, does not occur in the Roman book, neither is it in the Monte Casino Missal of 1515. Dr. Legg gives several other deviations from the common text of this sequence as given by Mone, Daniel, and in a Sarum Missal (Antwerp, 1527) which we have before us, as follows (the numerals here refer to the lines in Mone's *Hymni*, t. i. No. 254, pp. 324-5): 22, 'patris gloria;'; 35, 'similis una;'; 38, 'hec quia uenit;'; 39, 'communis;'; 45, 'sensus;'; 57 (*om.* 'fons') 'sapientie;'; 58, 'in tui solius.' Some of these are probably clerical errors, but the differences are sufficiently numerous to suggest the thought that when the work is issued complete, a search for various readings in the sequences may be not unfruitful. As to entirely new sequences, unknown to Neale and other students of English liturgies, the *Temporale* could hardly be expected to be very productive. The Monte Casino Missal of the Congregation of St. Justina of

Padua  
Tempo  
Whitsu  
charac  
and 'I  
Uses,  
'Almip  
Mearn  
1529,  
salvato  
author  
British  
full of  
attenti  
the pr  
unkno  
Thoma  
render  
from th  
of the  
Febru  
In  
look ba  
of the  
If we  
which  
from t  
govern  
such o  
follow  
and th  
with R  
Winch  
*alienus*  
that he  
what h  
But in  
Westm  
course  
the N  
plained  
A  
from th  
1 TH  
'Pange  
adsit,  
March  
defunct  
Mass i  
(Philot

Padua has eleven hymns and sequences in all ;<sup>1</sup> Westminster in the *Temporale alone* has more than twice that number. Looking at Whitsuntide, which has produced some sequences of a remarkable character, we find (for Westminster) besides 'Alma chorus Domini' and 'Laudes Deo devota[s],' which are common to all the English Uses, 'Eja musa' with the tropary of Ethelred, Sarum, and Hereford, 'Almiphona jam gaudia,' which (according to Messrs. Warren and Mearns in Julian's *Dictionary*) found its way into the Sens Missal, 1529, and occurs in several twelfth-century English MSS. ; 'Christe salvator Jesu hel [Julian 'et'] Alpha,' for which we know no other authority but the English collection of Sequences, cir. 1100, in the British Museum, Reg. 8, c. xiii. The language of these compositions, full of half-forgotten Greek theology, is probably worth the special attention of some capable student. Dr. Legg has brought to light in the present volume one sequence which would otherwise have been unknown, 'Per unius ortum floris,' a composition for the Feast of St. Thomas of Canterbury, which political rather than religious zeal rendered for three centuries illegible. An English poetical version from the pen of the vicar of Christ Church, Bolton, and an account of the recovery of the text appeared in the *Guardian* early in February this year.

In seeking the origins of the Use of Westminster we naturally look backward from A.D. 1266, when Abbot Ware ordered the customs of the monastery to be committed to writing (Brit. Mus. Otho C. xi.). If we consider the history of Westminster during the 150 years in which the Use of Sarum was in process of development, beginning from the days of S. Osmund, we find the Abbey of Westminster governed at first by a succession of abbots directly connected with such churches as Jumièges, Fécamp, Bec, and Caen. Some who followed were connected at least by birth or descent with Normandy, and the last abbot of that race (William de Humez) was contemporary with Richard Poore of Salisbury. Of Abbot Walter, who came from Winchester about 1175, we learn that he settled naturally ('*non alienus*') in his new home. Is it too great an assumption to infer that he found at Westminster an order of Divine service similar to what had prevailed long before under Dunstan's rule? Perhaps it is. But in any case we shall be slow to believe that Norman influence at Westminster left no traces in the service of the altar, though in the course of centuries much of it has perished with the Caen stone and the Norman chestnut wood of which Sir Christopher Wren complained so bitterly.

A good idea of the character of the original may be formed from the seven illustrations (including miniatures and initial letters

<sup>1</sup> The metres in *Missale Casinense*, 1515, are the hymns 'Gloria, laus,' 'Pange lingua,' and 'Lustris sex,' and the sequences 'Sancti Spiritus adsit,' 'Lauda Sion,' 'Leta quies magni Ducis' (for St. Benet's Day, March 21), 'Dies ire,' 'Homo natus' (*Sequentia minor S. Bernardi, pro defunctis*), 'Cenam cum discipulis,' 'Reminiscentia beati sanguinis' (votive Mass in *honore Panarum D. N. J. C.*), and 'Laudent celi conditorem' (*Philothei monachi Casinensis*, in SS. Resurrectionis die).

depicting ceremonial) which have been added to the volume by the generosity of Canon Cooke and Mr. Dewick, two officers of the Henry Bradshaw Society. The present volume does not cover that portion of the Missal in which the ritual music begins. It may be questioned, however, whether the music in the other part of the original would be worth the cost of reproduction, unless it be that in the Coronation Office, as the music of the canon of the Mass is accessible in print already. The Latin text of the Epistles and Gospels differs a little from the printed Vulgate and from the ordinary printed Missals, although this is chiefly in the phrase introduced with a view to the liturgical adaptation of Holy Scripture. It may, perhaps, be suggested that the printing of these passages at length need scarcely be continued in all the liturgical texts produced for the Society, and we hope there may be many. But that variations exist is apparent upon collation, and we may foresee the time when careful attention to such *minutiae* will enable the comparative-liturgiologist to solve such difficult questions as at present baffle us in our attempts to trace the literary genealogy of our English liturgical Uses. It will not be the fault of Dr. Legg or of the Henry Bradshaw Society if the Westminster Missal is not one of the first to find its scientific description among its kindred of the Gregorian stock. For our own part we must wait till the saints'-day services appear, and we are encouraged to hope that this will be at no distant date.

With reference to the test suggested by Dr. Henderson in his preface to the York Missal, Westminster will be found to agree with Hereford in having 'Principium' for the Gospel on the first Sunday in Advent, 'Patientes' with Arbutnot for the Epistle on the first Wednesday, and 'Venit Jo. Bapt.' for the Gospel on the Friday. But the Alleluya *Versus* on the second Sunday is *Letatus* with York. This last is found also in the Benedictine Missal of 1515, to which we have so often referred. The Westminster kalendar bears naturally some affinity to that prefixed to the Peterborough *Consuetudinarium*, but is by no means identical in its selection of saints, while the festivals for which copes and albs respectively are ordered are not the same for these two English abbeys.

The rubrics in the *Temporale* are short, and the Roman stations are not indicated. The kalendar has but one secular note in it beside the usual memorial lines and zodiacal dates. This is 'Bellum anglorum' on October 14. Readers of the poetry of a former canon of Westminster, Charles Kingsley, will not require to be told in what war it was that

' Evil sped the battle's play  
Upon the Pope Calixtus' day.'

*The Greek Devotions of Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester*, from a manuscript given by him to Archbishop Laud. Edited by P. GOLDSMITH MEDD, M.A. Published under the direction of the Tract Committee. (London : S.P.C.K., 1892.)

THIS publication represents a 'find' of signal value. Hitherto, as Canon Medd, in his interesting and luminous preface, expresses it,

'all ed  
with D  
Greek  
his sec  
Hall, i  
By a s  
script  
Fellow  
sellers  
'the li  
authent  
accord  
cover.  
the up  
great  
Booke  
in Sept  
from S  
mitted  
an app  
that th  
afterwa  
after c  
impress  
only o  
It was  
hands,  
own ed  
reprod  
part, l  
volum  
Greek  
of the  
tically  
many  
lecture  
logy. V  
the sa  
*Spirit*  
have c  
rosity,  
on hav  
munio  
is a sin  
*Pastor*  
L  
M  
D  
FOR m  
In the

'all editions and versions of the "Devotions"' of Andrewes (beginning with Drake's in 1648) had been based on a transcript of the original Greek manuscript, made by Samuel Wright, who as a youth had been his secretary, and preserved in his old college, then called Pembroke Hall, in Cambridge. It was printed at the Clarendon Press in 1675. By a singular coincidence, 'a much earlier and more authentic manuscript came ten years ago into the hands of the Rev. R. G. Livingstone, Fellow of' the college of the same name in Oxford. The booksellers from whom he procured it in 1882 could not trace it beyond 'the library of an old clergyman in Norfolk,' but had no doubt of its authenticity. It had been sold as genuine about a century ago, according to an extract from an old catalogue pasted inside the vellum cover. Mr. Livingstone found on the upper half of the outside of the upper cover of this volume words which associate it with another great name: 'My reverend Friend Bishop Andrewes gave me this Booke a little before his death. W. Bath et Welles.' Andrewes died in September 1626, and Laud had been translated, a month before, from St. David's to Bath and Wells. In 1883 Mr. Livingstone submitted the manuscript to the authorities of the British Museum, 'where an application of acid momentarily revived the writing, and was assured that there was no reason for doubting that the inscription was in Bishop, afterwards Archbishop, Laud's handwriting.' Canon Medd adds that after carefully studying the manuscript in the character of editor, his impression is 'that it is an original autograph (though, possibly, not the only one) actually written, and long used by the saintly Bishop himself. It was his dying gift of affection . . . to his friend Laud, into whose hands, we know, many of his innumerable papers passed.' Of his own editorial work Canon Medd says that he has 'endeavoured to reproduce the manuscript faithfully, page by page, and, for the most part, line by line,' only correcting 'manifest clerical errors.' The volume is beautifully printed, and furnished with shorter prefaces in Greek and in Latin, the former being specially intended for members of the Eastern Church; and it is further enriched by a characteristically exquisite passage on the 'Devotions' in themselves, which many readers, we trust, will recognize at once as part of Dean Church's lecture on Andrewes in the volume called *Masters of English Theology*. We cannot forbear to quote a few words from another lecture on the same great life, by Dean Paget, at the end of his book on the *Spirit of Discipline*: 'It may be doubted whether any uninspired words have done more to teach men to pray in truth and purity, and generosity, and self-abasement.' We heartily congratulate Canon Medd on having been the instrument of presenting to the Anglican communion the venerable original of 'Devotions' to which such eulogy is a simple due.

*Pastoral Letters and Synodal Charges addressed to the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese of Lichfield.* By WILLIAM DALRYMPLE MACLAGAN, Archbishop of York. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton, and Co., 1892.)

FOR more reasons than one we welcome this volume most heartily. In the first place, its intrinsic worth is great; it gives us the expe-

rience of one who, having been for many years an active and successful parish priest in large and important spheres, has for more than ten years been equally active and successful in the higher office of bishop over one of the busiest and most popular dioceses in the kingdom. In every page we trace the handiwork, not of the mere theorist, but of one who might say with truth respecting the various branches of Church work upon which he touches, '*Quorum pars magna fui.*' The '*Pastoral Letters*' are thoroughly practical and thoroughly earnest; and though the then Bishop of Lichfield writes in a tone of authority, as if he not only wished, but meant to be obeyed, he does not address his clergy '*de haut en bas,*' but rather as one who had been himself a parish priest, and could therefore sympathize with their difficulties, but who could also, for the same reason, not be imposed upon by any plea that those difficulties were insurmountable when he knew that they had been, and might be surmounted.

Another point of interest in this volume is the light which it throws upon the internal work of a great diocese, which outsiders could hardly gain elsewhere. It is, of course, impossible to touch upon all the subjects here discussed, and difficult to make a selection; but we give the following specimen, which will serve as well as any other to illustrate the writer's style and matter, and will also bring out a point that has long seemed to us very necessary to enforce in connexion with that most important part of a parish priest's work, his preparation of candidates for Confirmation:

'It is most necessary that we should bring the subject more frequently before the young. We must speak of it to the children both in the day-schools and the Sunday-schools of our parishes; and especially in our Catechising and our Children's Services in the church. We must teach them to look forward to it from their earliest years as a precious time of blessing; and not only remind them of it a few weeks before the Confirmation will be held. We must lead them to regard it, not so much as a time for making a very solemn promise, from which they might well shrink back with fear, but as a time for receiving a gift of God's love and God's grace; a time for being confirmed or strengthened with the Holy Ghost the Comforter. They must be taught to look upon Confirmation not solely as a duty to be done, but also as a blessing to be desired and enjoyed; and thus they will value it and long for it with simple faith and childlike eagerness' (p. 105).

The volume is divided into three parts, the first being entitled '*Pastoral Letters,*' the second '*Occasional Papers,*' and the third '*Synodal Charges.*' Now a '*pastoral letter*' and an address at a large public meeting are different things, and are, naturally, composed in a somewhat different way. To join them together in one book is rather to impair the unity of the book, and the '*Pastoral Letters*' are so good and so complete in themselves that we must confess we should have liked to see them published separately. The insertion of the Presidential Address at the Wolverhampton Church Congress, interesting as it is, seems to us particularly incongruous. At the same time all the papers and charges are well worth preserving; and rather

than n  
somev  
Letter  
volum  
for the  
by ma  
read,  
sent  
of the  
being  
has so  
of real  
hard w  
if it we  
a man  
desire  
if he d

To my  
H  
of  
to

IN con  
that an  
much  
Church  
as a H  
type;  
stantia  
put int  
without  
sure (f  
may re  
mixed  
the ne  
spiritua  
ablene

'Is  
now o  
tenden  
benevo  
downw  
fashion  
useful  
sanitar  
be the  
Christi  
tions o  
princip  
enterpr  
what t  
VOI



than not have them at all, we are well content to have them in this somewhat unsuitable connexion. But to our mind the 'Pastoral Letters' are by far the most interesting and unique part of the volume; and we earnestly hope (here we come to the third reason for the hearty welcome we would give to the work) they may be read by many who form their ideas of a modern bishop from what they read, or rather see, in the pages, say, of *Punch*. There he is represented as a man who is engaged in attending the social gatherings of the aristocracy or riding in the Park—the gaiters and the shovel-hat being always well to the front. The present volume shows that a bishop has something more to do than this—and does it. There is a tone of reality about Dr. Maclagan's words, and an indirect assumption of hard work done—an assumption that could be instantly disproved if it were false—which will convince any unprejudiced person that 'if a man desire the office of a bishop' in the nineteenth century 'he desireth a good work,' but one which will tax all his energies, and will, if he does not take care, wear him out before his time.

*To my Younger Brethren: Chapters on Pastoral Life and Work.* By H. C. G. MOULE, Principal of Ridley Hall, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1892.)

IN comparing this book with that of Dr. Maclagan, the first thought that arises in our mind is the cheering one that after all there may be much more unity of feeling between different parties in the same Church than is commonly supposed. Dr. Maclagan, of course, writes as a High Churchman, Mr. Moule as a Low Churchman of the best type; and yet on a vast number of essential points they are substantially at one. We are sure that Mr. Moule might with advantage put into the hands of his Low Church pupils Dr. Maclagan's book without shocking his own or their prejudices; and we are still more sure (for here we speak from experience) that a High Churchman may read Mr. Moule's striking and interesting pages with almost un-mixed edification. Would not both high and low agree in owning the necessity of 'the secret walk with God'? Would not earnest, spiritually-minded clergymen, whether high or low, admit the reasonableness of the following admirable appeal?

'Is there not far and wide in the "Christian World"—I do not speak now of the exterior regions of avowed scepticism or indifference—a tendency to merge the whole idea of religion in that of philanthropic benevolence, and thereby to draw inevitably the idea of philanthropy downward in the end into its least noble manifestations? Is it not a fashionable thing to regard the Christian ministry, for example, as a useful and ready mechanism with which to work out the social and sanitary amelioration of the lives of the multitude, and so to take him to be the best qualified clergyman who is, perhaps, the most "muscular" of Christians, or the cleverest at the invention or superintendence of recreations on a large scale, or the quickest student and exponent of the principles or theories of political economy, or possibly of socialistic enterprize? But all this may entirely leave out the very life-blood of what the New Testament means by the Gospel of the grace of God; and

VOL. XXXIV.—NO. LXVIII.

K K

in many, many cases it does entirely leave it out. A conception of "Church Work" is widely entertained, and thought to be adequate, out of which is practically dropped all the mystery, and all the mercy. . . . It is just one wave of the great anti-supernatural tide of our time. Christian work is viewed as much as possible as man's work for man in the present world, under the example, doubtless, of the beneficent life of our Lord, but not under the shadow of Calvary, nor in the light of Pentecost, nor in the definite prospect of an immortality of holy glory' (pp. 29-30).

Must not all of us be thoroughly at one with him when he impresses with equal earnestness and simplicity the need his younger brethren in the ministry have of a much deeper 'private Bible study'? And though, alas! we fear we shall not carry all High Churchmen with us, yet we are sure that all who follow the lines of the *Church Quarterly Review* will agree as cordially with his keen and only too true remarks on the so-called higher criticism, particularly of the Old Testament. Again, what true High Churchman will not cordially endorse the excellent and much needed, though rarely given, cautions to the young clergyman as to his behaviour in his lodgings or in the clergy-house? (p. 83 &c.) and the even still more needed advice as to his relations with the other sex? and about his money arrangements? and about his loyalty as assistant-curate to his rector or vicar? (p. 114 &c.) No less excellent, though perhaps a little more trite, are his counsels about parochial visitation, and his hints 'to his younger brethren' about preaching, which are as conspicuous for their good sense as for their spirituality and earnestness.

There are, of course, points on which we cannot altogether go along with Mr. Moule. His sacramental views are those of his school (see pp. 182-6), and therefore not those advocated in this *Review*; and we could hardly go so far, particularly in addressing the younger clergy, as to say with him that preaching is 'the goal and summing up of all other parts and works of the ministry' (p. 287). But we prefer dwelling upon those points on which we agree with Mr. Moule; and they are so many that, *exceptis excipiendis*, we can cordially recommend his work to the younger clergy as the work of one who, from the nature of his position, has had unusual opportunities of observing their needs, their weaknesses, and their difficulties, and who brings to bear upon his observations a spirit of piety and earnestness and a keen good sense which makes them worthy of the closest attention.

*The Book of Common Prayer, with Historical Notes.* Edited by the Rev. JAMES CORNFORD. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode.)

It would be difficult to find a larger amount of information packed into a smaller compass than in this modest little volume. The 'Historical Notes' are simply marginal, but they give the date and source of every single rubric, collect, canticle, creed—in short, every part of every office from the beginning of 'The Order of Morning Prayer' to the close of the service for June 20. The notes add little to the bulk of the book, which might be used without inconvenience

for  
to wh  
to a  
for th  
made  
by al  
the e  
to ha  
only  
Whea  
prove  
to th  
enou  
publi  
servi  
that i  
morn  
servi

The

THE  
Bisho  
very s  
both,  
ander  
much  
who d  
single  
pressi  
We d  
spurs  
of ima  
of thi  
read,  
that o  
late B  
his in  
of his  
circu  
matt  
izing  
sermo  
menta  
of all  
not in  
other  
into t  
oblig

for an ordinary Prayer Book in church. There are only two points to which we would venture to call the author's attention with a view to a future edition. His note on the term 'oblations' in the 'Prayer for the Church Militant' is simply, 'seems to include any offering made for religious or charitable purposes.' Now surely it is admitted by all competent authorities that the word 'oblations' here refers to the elements of Bread and Wine which have then just been, or ought to have been, placed reverently on the Altar. Mr. Cornford has only to turn to such obvious and easily accessible works as those of Wheatley, Hook, and Proctor to find this not only asserted, but proved by unimpeachable testimony. The other point is in reference to the proper time for the publication of Banns. The rubric is plain enough, but it has been so often misunderstood to mean that the publication is to take place after the Second Lesson in the morning service, as well as in the evening when there is no morning service, that it would be well to add a note that the only proper place in the morning service, when there is a Communion or Ante-Communion service, is after the offertory sentences.

*The Leading Ideas of the Gospels.* BY WILLIAM ALEXANDER, Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1892.)

THERE is a certain resemblance between Bishop Alexander and Bishop Westcott in their mode of writing on the Gospels; both are very suggestive, both are full of beautiful and poetical thoughts, and both, we are bound to add, are rather hard to read. Bishop Alexander works out his theory with great ability, and gives us incidentally much food for reflection. He also avoids a danger to which writers who desire *θέσιν διαφυλάττειν* are peculiarly liable; we can find no single instance of his straining a point, giving reins to his fancy, or pressing into his service texts which are really foreign to the purpose. We *do* find, what we had a right to expect from one who has won his spurs both as an orator and as a poet, traces both of eloquence and of imagination; but he is withal eminently rational. What, in spite of this rare combination of merits, makes his book rather hard to read, is a certain jerkiness and want of flow in the style, very like that of the present Bishop of Durham, and very *unlike* that of the late Bishop of Durham, who carries us along with him not only by his interesting matter, but by the rhythmic flow and consecutiveness of his style. There may also be another reason arising from the circumstances of the publication. It is the reproduction of the matter of a set of sermons published in 1871, but with the sermonizing element removed. The result is that the book is not a set of sermons, nor yet exactly a set of essays, nor an exposition or commentary on the Gospels, but something that partakes of the nature of all three. After all, however, the fault may lie in the reviewer, not in his author; and we only give these preliminary cautions, lest other readers, finding the same difficulties that we found in getting into the swing of the book, and not being bound by the same solemn obligations to grapple with those difficulties, should be tempted to

throw it aside. This would be a great mistake. It may cost an effort to persevere, but the game is well worth the candle; and though it may be hard to get afloat, yet when the mind is once under way it will go on swimmingly to the end with pleasure and profit. Bishop Alexander's theory is that 'each Gospel is arranged round one centre, or at least round a few central points. This particular aspect, this grouping point, or principle of selection, is the Leading Idea of the Evangelist' (p. 3). The following passage describes in brief what these leading ideas of the several Evangelists are:—

'In St. Matthew we have Christ's earthly existence as a life freely moulding itself in a *pre-designated form*; in St. Mark as a *strong* life; in St. Luke as a *tender* life; in St. John as literally a *Divine* life, the life of God humanified, lived under human conditions and, to some extent, limitations. In the first, we see Jesus as the Messiah; in the second, as the Son of God; in the third, as the Son of Man; in the fourth, as the God-Man. With St. Matthew, the chief factor is the conception of prophecy; with St. Mark, the conception of power; with St. Luke, the conception of beauty; with St. John, the conception of Divinity. In the first, the predominant elements are fulfilment and sacrifice; in the second, action and conquest; in the third, forgiveness and universal grace; in the fourth, idealism and dogma. St. Matthew will ever appeal most powerfully to the Old Testament scholar; St. Mark to the ecclesiastical organizer, to him who is attracted to the outward things of Christ; while St. Luke has a voice of charm for the imaginative and tender, and St. John supplies the chosen food of the mystic and of the sacramental instinct' (pp. 10-11).

The whole book is an expansion of these ideas; but instead of following the author in detail, which would, of course, be impossible within a short space, it will be well to call attention to one or two out of many suggestive thoughts which occur incidentally. What an admirable comment on the once hackneyed but now less-heard expression, 'hearing the Gospel,' is the following:—

'A common view of hearing the Gospel is this. A man has been so unhappy as never to have listened to a faithful preacher up to a certain time. Then first hears of God's eternal purpose, of an effectual calling by His Spirit working in due season, of conversion, of assurance, of perseverance. He feels uplifted from this lower earth. . . . We will not speak lightly of statements, some of which are not only the stay and comfort of loving hearts, but eternally true; while others are only exaggerations of blessed and eternal truths. But . . . they are not that which the New Testament calls the Gospel. For the New Testament Gospel is this. The glad news that for us sinners and for our salvation, the Word of God has taken the manhood into God; . . . for us come upon earth; for us lived; for us wrought miracles; for us died; for us broke the prison-bars of the tomb; for us ascended; for us sent down the Holy Ghost. . . . Now, if this be the true idea of the Gospel let us be assured that the Church preaches not this or that fragment of it, but the whole fully and unceasingly. By her great days of observance, by the Christian seasons, we have a living, permanent, continuous preaching of the Gospel as St. Mark understood the word, taken up into the structure and texture of our lives, diffused round the circling year,' &c. (pp. 78-9).

Equally admirable is his explanation of the likeness between the language of our Lord in St. John's Gospel and that of St. John in his Epistles. He points out how the disciples of great human teachers like Newman and Arnold have unconsciously caught their style and tone and sums up an irresistible argument: 'We may conclude without hesitation that John did not give language to Christ, but Christ to John' (see pp. 197-202). There is a passage on the miracles, again, which is to our mind a perfect gem:—

'We are used to reasoning from miracles up to Christ; may we not reason from Christ down to the miracles? Given a being like Christ, then the Christmas Eve, the star of the Epiphany, the glory of the Transfiguration, the riven rock, the rent veil, the opened grave, the Ascension to the heaven of heavens, are but the fitting framework of that divine picture,' &c. (pp. 227-8).

We are sorely tempted to quote the whole passage, but space forbids; and enough, it is hoped, has been already quoted to show that the reader should not be deterred by any initiatory difficulties from studying carefully and thoughtfully—and, may we not add, prayerfully?—this most suggestive volume.

*The Pastoral Visitation of the Sick and Suffering.* By HENRY SIDEBOTHAM, Chaplain of the Church of St. John the Evangelist, Mentone, and Canon of Gibraltar. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton, and Co.)

THIS book, like the last, is written especially for the younger clergy (see Preface), and deals with one part, but that a very important one, of the great subject so well handled by the present Archbishop of York and by Mr. Moule. It is not necessary to say much about the offices and prayers of which it mainly consists, seeing that they are chiefly drawn either from the Book of Common Prayer or from such writers as Bishops Andrewes, Ken, and Wilson, names which are themselves a recommendation and need no comment. But the first forty pages, entitled 'Notes on Visiting the Sick,' should not be neglected, for they give many valuable hints to an inexperienced visitor from one who has learnt his lesson in the school of long experience. Let us take as a specimen Canon Sidebotham's judicious remarks on the delicate question as to whether the clergyman ought to warn the sick person of the hopelessness of his recovery:—

'We should never mislead the sick, or let them suppose that they are on the road to recovery when we know the reverse, but we should impress on them always that the issues of life and death are in God's hands. Our object should be to help them to prepare for death, but to regard it constantly as "the gate" by which they are to pass, and that beyond the gate is "far better." We should remember, also, that repentance under the fear of death is much less likely to be real and lasting than repentance in view of a possible return to the duties and temptations of the present life. If you tell a person that he will certainly die, his probation is practically over. If not submissive to God's will, he will be in a new position. He is alarmed, and cannot himself tell whether he is the subject of godly sorrow and repentance or the victim of remorse. As pastors, love, and not fear, is our motive-power. Besides, in ordinary

cases the preparation for a good life, in the event of possible recovery of health, is the best preparation for death. He who is most fit to live is best prepared to die. To turn away from the world, when the world must be left altogether, is not a great demand, but to turn from the world and give the whole heart to God when the world may yet have something to offer, demands an amount of earnest resolution and faith, which is in itself a preparation for whatever issue may await the sufferer. By premature or ill-judged announcements of approaching death you may easily shorten the patient's life and abridge the time for his repentance' (pp. 34-5).

The following passage is also worthy of careful attention :—

'We shall often receive help from nurses and attendants on the sick, especially if we show sympathy with them, and remember their own difficulties and needs. Too often they are overlooked, and a word of counsel or comfort will help them not to be weary in well-doing, but to bear patiently with some poor invalid who needs much forbearance, while they, in turn, will be fellow-workers with us in our labour of love' (p. 32).

This is so thoroughly true that we are rather disappointed to find among the many prayers, which embrace almost every possible emergency, none having especial reference to the nurses and attendants on the sick. It is also a question whether, in a work in which space was valuable (for we presume the book was intended for a pocket manual), it was desirable to devote fifty pages or more to hymns, the great majority of which are perfectly well known to everybody. However, the singing or even the reading of a hymn, especially a familiar hymn, is often most comforting to a sick person, and if the insertion of these hymns draws attention to the fact, a good purpose will have been answered.

*History of the Church of England for Schools and Families.* By the Rev. A. H. HORE. (Oxford and London : Parker and Co., 1891.)

MR. HORE is already well known in connexion with the important subject of English Church history, and in this volume he has condensed within 500 pages the whole history of the Church of England from its foundation in 597 A.D. up to the present day. He writes from a very decidedly Anglo-Catholic point of view, but with an evident desire to be fair all round. Of course it would be undesirable in such a work to make any parade of original research, but he shows great skill in selecting salient points, and in marshalling his facts in a judicious and interesting way. He has made, so far as we can discover, no serious error ; but there are several slips, some of them obviously printer's errors, which it would be desirable to correct in a future edition, for in a book intended 'for schools and families,' who *must* trust to their author, accuracy is everything ; so he will pardon us for calling his attention to some of them. The name of the missionary bishop and martyr was Patteson, not Pattison (p. 31). In p. 72 we have Witenagemot in one sentence and Witnagemot in the very next. The great divine who wrote the life of Waterland was Van Mildert, not Van Mildart (p. 414). The

deis  
Wo  
'C  
of  
men  
way  
adv  
of  
Fin  
Cop  
men  
grie  
The  
gen  
to a  
hist  
of li

The

TH  
a sti  
aday  
mat  
and  
Mon  
Mr.  
poin  
extr  
littl  
Chu

It is  
a fo  
was  
ing  
of P  
Spir  
Wit  
stati  
that  
the  
thos  
in t  
quit  
Plat  
'Po  
The



deist who wrote against the miracles of Christ was Woolston, not Woolstan (p. 431); and the more famous deist, Tindal, who wrote 'Christianity as old as the Creation,' was a Fellow of All Souls', not of Lincoln College (p. 432), though it is true that he had been a member of the latter. 'A. Kempis' (p. 436) is not quite a correct way of writing the name 'Thomas à Kempis.' By a manifest inadvertence he writes in p. 455 of Law's '*Spiritual Call*,' and in p. 466 of Dr. Sumner as *Prebend*, instead of Prebendary of Durham. Finally, the Provost of Oriel, who preceded Dr. Hawkins, was Dr. Copleston not Coplestone (p. 481). This last would be hardly worth mentioning were it not that Dr. Copleston himself used to be grievously hurt when any one put an 'e' to the end of his name. These are, of course, mere trifles, and do not at all detract from the general trustworthiness of the book, which we can safely recommend to all who desire to gain a fairly correct idea of the nature and history of the English Church without wading through a vast amount of literature on the subject.

*The Church and Her Story.* By G. H. F. NYE. With Illustrations. (London: Griffith, Farran, and Co.)

THIS volume covers the same ground as the last; but it is written in a still more popular style, and is still more condensed. The one is adapted for students who do not desire to go very far into the matter, the other for those who do not profess to be students at all, and who require to be attracted by woodcuts and leaded type. Moreover, as is natural in an officer of the Church Defence Society, Mr. Nye writes more from what may be called the Establishment point of view than Mr. Hore does. He accomplishes his object extremely well, and we can confidently recommend his unpretending little volume to all who desire to have in a very brief compass 'the Church's story.'

*Dialogues on the Efficacy of Prayer.* By POWIS HOULT. (London: Chapman and Hall, 1892.)

It is quite refreshing to a student of the old theology to see revived a form of composition which seemed to have died out, but which was a very common, and sometimes very effective, mode of conducting a religious controversy in the eighteenth century. As one thinks of Berkeley's *Alciphron*, or the *Minute Philosopher*, of William Law's *Spirit of Prayer* and *Spirit of Love*, and of Sherlock's *Trial of the Witnesses*, it is impossible to despise the all but obsolete mode of stating a case in the form of a dialogue. Of course, the danger is that the writer is apt to make it a battle between giants and dwarfs, the giants being those who represent his own opinions, the dwarfs those of the opposite side. But there is certainly something in the plea which 'Powis Houlst' urges for what he terms, not quite accurately, 'the Socratic method.' Socrates, as represented by Plato, does not argue with the Sophists quite in the way in which 'Powis Houlst' and his predecessors in the last century argue. There is nothing of the Socratic 'irony' about him or them. But

the plea itself is valid that 'it is always more or less of a disadvantage to have but one side of a question presented to our comprehension at a time,' and we are bound to say that 'Powis Hoult' does his very best in his *Dialogues* to present both sides. The antagonists are fairly matched, and though of course in the end the right side wins, it is after a real, and not a sham, fight. Without saying that 'Powis Hoult' is exactly a Berkeley, a Law, or a Sherlock, we yet think that he is an able man, and that he has written an able book; and as it is all on the side of religion *versus* irreligion, we heartily wish his bold experiment the success it deserves.

*The Church and Her Doctrine.* (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1891.)

ONE would have thought that, in a volume entitled *The Church and Her Doctrine*, the writers would first have told us what they meant by 'the Church.' But the eight distinguished gentlemen—that is, the Bishop of Sydney, the Rev. C. H. Waller, Canons Hoare and Girdlestone, Sir Emilius Laurie, the Bishop of Ossory, the Rev. H. C. G. Moule, and Dr. Wace—who contributed to the present volume have reversed the process. It is not until we come to the last paper that we learn definitely what their conception of the Church is, and when we *have* learnt it confusion is only worse confounded. The writer very properly asks us to 'consider the facts set before us in the New Testament;' but, unfortunately, we *have* considered the facts, and they lead us to a different conclusion from that which he draws. No doubt, as he says (p. 247 &c.), we find mention over and over again 'not only of the Church, but of "Churches;"' but it appears to us that the plural number is used simply to imply geographical distinctions, and that there is no hint whatever that any difference of doctrine might be expected in the Church of Corinth, the Church of Ephesus, the Church of Laodicea, and so forth. The writer lays great stress upon the difference between 'the invisible Church' and 'the visible Churches,' and the question we would like to ask is, Does the title 'The Church and Her Doctrine' refer to the doctrine of the invisible Church or of the visible Churches? Of the invisible Church? But the invisible Church consists of true members of Christ, and 'there are multitudes of true members of Christ alike in the Anglican community, in the Nonconformist communities, in the Scottish Presbyterian communities, in the Roman Catholic communities, in the Greek communities, in other Eastern communities' (p. 274); and if the doctrine of the Church is limited to what is taught in common by this heterogeneous mass, it becomes so small as to be almost as invisible as the invisible Church itself. Of the visible Churches? But in how many points do they all agree, and where is the line to be drawn? And as there is (to our mind) confusion about the Church whose doctrine is here expounded, it is not surprising that there should also be confusion about the statement of the doctrine itself. In the Creeds of Christendom each article is stated in regular and perfectly intelligible order. But in *The Church and Her Doctrine* it is difficult to see on what principle the order is arranged. We find ourselves in 'a mighty maze,'

and cannot add 'but not without a plan.' We begin quite rightly with 'the Holy Trinity,' on which the Bishop of Sydney makes some admirable remarks, for which we heartily thank him. But then we go on to 'the One Oblation of Christ,' and then to 'the Incarnation,' the oddest arrangement surely; for did not the Incarnation precede the Oblation? The same strange arrangement of papers is carried on throughout, until it reaches its climax in the last chapter but one, which is the longest in the book, and consists of a sort of *précis* of four Advent sermons. And then, last of all, comes the paper which surely should have come first, on 'the Church' which is supposed to hold all this doctrine. While fully appreciating the ability and earnestness which all the writers show, more or less, we can hardly recommend this volume to those who desire to have any clear idea of what is meant by 'the Church and Her Doctrine.'

*A Manual of Doctrine and Practice for Church Teachers.* By the Rev. J. SIDNEY BOUCHER. (London: Griffith, Farran, and Co.)

IN some respects this is the antipodes of the book we have just noticed. The very last thing that can be said of it is that it is wanting in method or vague in its statements. The title, 'A Manual of Doctrine and Practice,' is rather misleading. It suggests the idea of something very sound and very proper, but rather dry. But the most cursory perusal of these pages will convey a very different impression. In the brightest and liveliest manner Mr. Boucher defends the Church against all assailants. He is a thoroughgoing 'Ritualist' (in the absurd popular conception of that much-abused term), and finds in the English Church—yes, even in the Church of the Reformation—a full confirmation of his views. He hits hard, but it is always straight from the shoulder. His opponents, whether Dissenters, Evangelicals, Latitudinarians, or Romanists, will no doubt wince under his treatment of them, but they cannot justly complain that he deals any unfair blows. A partisan, as of course Mr. Boucher will be called, is apt to be carried away by his feelings into making inaccurate statements; but after a careful examination of the book we have been able to find no slips worth mentioning. This is the more noteworthy because Mr. Boucher deals with the utmost variety of topics, all, however, tending to one end—the defence of the English Church, as its doctrines and practice are understood by Anglo-Catholics. One of his best chapters—or papers, for the book is rather a collection of papers than a consecutive work—is that entitled 'Principles of the Reformation,' which, unlike some who think with him on other points, Mr. Boucher defends by thoroughly sound and, in our opinion, irrefragable arguments. Of course, those who through motives of delicacy shrink from calling a spade a spade will wish that Mr. Boucher had toned down many of his remarkably plain-spoken utterances; but to reach the popular mind one cannot be too plain spoken, and if Mr. Boucher is occasionally rather rough we cannot complain; for smooth speaking to the classes whom he evidently wishes to affect is really like pouring water upon a duck's back.

*The Ancient Fathers on the Office and Work of the Priesthood in the Church of Christ.* (London : Skeffington and Son, 1891.)

THE translator of these extracts from the Fathers, as we learn from the Preface, is a Mr. Edward Male, who also tells us that, for the correctness or otherwise, no one is responsible but himself. If he has the responsibility he has also the credit of the work, and we must begin by congratulating him on the remarkable success of his endeavour. His English flows as easily as if it were the language in which the book was written, and, from a comparison of one or two passages with the original, we should think it is also a very faithful translation. In one or two places where the point of the passage lies in a paronomasia, he has wisely given the Latin in brackets, e.g. 'It is the glory of the prelate to esteem himself miserable and weak, unequal to his burden (*onus*), and unworthy of the honour (*honor*) thereof' (p. 51). The 'h' in 'honor' is of course not sounded. Turning to the matter of the book, the peculiar interest of it lies not so much in the counsel given—though this is uniformly excellent, and sets a high standard of clerical life—as in the fact impressed upon one in every page, that time and space make little or no difference in the outward work or in the inner life of those who bear office in the Church of Christ. What was appropriate for a priest in the third, fourth, or fifth centuries—to which most of the matter of the book belongs—is equally appropriate to the priest of the nineteenth, to whom we heartily commend the little volume, which he cannot read in a proper spirit without advantage.

*The Selected Sermons of Thomas Fuller, D.D., 1631-1659.* Edited by J. E. BAILEY, completed by W. E. A. AXON. Two Volumes. (London : Unwin Brothers, 1891.)

THERE is a singular historical interest attached to these sermons of Thomas Fuller, most of which were composed and preached during the troubled times between 1640 and 1655. They give the views of one who probably represented a large class, but a class which, from the nature of the case, would not come into such prominence as men of an extreme type on either side would be sure to do. Fuller was a royalist, and had quite an enthusiastic attachment to King Charles I.; but he was essentially a man of peace, and was very cautious not to say anything in his sermons which would tend to hinder rather than advance the cause of peace. It cannot be said that he had not the courage of his opinions, but his opinions were not of the kind to make him a violent partisan. Hence, while he was attacked on the one hand by the Puritan Saltmarsh, he was also attacked on the other by the Royalist Heylin. He gloried in being a moderate man, but indignantly repudiated the conclusion that he was therefore a lukewarm one. His distinction between moderation and lukewarmness is so good, and so exactly represents his own position, that it is worth quoting at some length :—

'As Lukewarmnesse hath often fared the better (the more mens ignorance) for pretending neighbourhood to moderation ; so moderation

(the vicin  
mo  
nesse  
that  
obse  
(thou  
is fix  
the M  
finde  
a dit  
Luke  
owne  
the q  
conso  
so he  
will  
the d  
And  
and  
soeve  
hono  
Desa

T  
us is  
rathe  
rathe  
1143  
certa  
these  
Full  
Ask  
Full  
Full  
the  
The  
rais  
more  
wort  
of do  
this  
men  
duce  
publ  
whos  
minu  
all th  
by J  
further  
whet  
ordin  
this

(the more her wrong) hath many times suffered for having some supposed vicinity with lukewarmnesse. However they are at a grand distance, moderation being an wholesome cordiall to the soule; whilst lukewarmnesse (a temper which seekes to reconcile hot and cold) is so distastefull that *health it selfe* seemes sick of it, and vomits it out. And we may observe these differences betwixt them. First, the Lukewarme man (though it be hard to tell what he is, who knowes not what he is himselfe) is fix'd to no one opinion, and hath no certaine creed to beleieve: Whereas the Moderate man sticks to his principles, taking Truth wheresoever he findes it, in the opinions of friend or foe; gathering an herb though in a ditch, and throwing away a weed though in a garden. Secondly, the Lukewarme man is both the archer and marke himselfe; aiming only at his owne outward security. The Moderate man levels at the glory of God, the quiet of the Church, the choosing of the Truth, and contenting of his conscience. Lastly, the Lukewarme man, as hee will live in any Religion, so he will dye for none. The Moderate man, what he hath warily chosen, will valiantly maintaine, at least wise intends and desires to defend it, to the death. The Kingdome of Heaven (saith our Saviour) suffereth violence. And in this sense, I may say, the most Moderate men are the most violent, and will not abate an hoofe or haire breadth in their opinions, whatsoever it cost them. And time will come when Moderate men shall be honoured as *God's Doves*, though now they be hooted at, as *Owles in the Desert*' (i. 335).

The only complaint we can make against the two volumes before us is that, if anything, the editors have done their part too well, or rather, too fully. At any rate they must have had the specialist rather than the general reader in their mind's eye when they issued 1143 octavo pages of or about some of the writings of one who certainly did not stand in the first rank of divines, especially as in these 1143 pages there is hardly a word from or about that part of Fuller's writings on which his fame chiefly, if not exclusively, rests. Ask any man of average education what he knows about Thomas Fuller, and he will tell you that he has heard of, and perhaps read, Fuller's *Worthies* and Fuller's *Church History*, and that he associates the name with quaint conceits and racy epigrammatic descriptions. The editors of the present volumes may rejoin that this is the very *raison d'être* of their work. People, they might say, *ought* to know more about a man who was not only a biographer of worthies, but a worthy himself; and they have now given them the opportunity of doing so. And certainly no stone has been left unturned to effect this desirable object. Each sermon, or group of sermons, or commentary, is reproduced (as the Gresham Press knows how to reproduce) in the attractive old-fashioned style in which it was originally published; elaborate introductions (some by Mr. J. E. Bailey, after whose lamented death the work was taken up by W. E. A. Axon) explain minutely the circumstances under which the sermon was written, and all the historical allusions contained; and there is a 'Life' of Fuller by J. E. Bailey prefixed to vol. i.; so that the reader need go no further afield to know all about his author. One's only fear is whether it be not overdone; is life quite long enough to allow the ordinary human being so much time as must be required to master this big work? Would not a selection of the most interesting ser-

mons—say those specially connected with the history of the times—with much shorter introductions, have been more likely to answer the purpose? One page of plain facts would, with the introductions, have been quite sufficient to guide the reader without reprinting the whole of the *Lecture on the Life and Wit of T. Fuller*, which, though good enough as a lecture delivered at Manchester, is intensely modern, and therefore strangely out of place in a facsimile reprint of seventeenth-century sermons. Still more so, we venture to think, is the frontispiece of vol. ii., which is almost a ludicrous contrast to the frontispiece of vol. i. And, finally, though it is no concern of ours, we cannot help wondering what Mr. Morris Fuller will say when he finds that his elaborate biography of his distinguished namesake and, we believe, relative is entirely ignored.

*The Peace of the Church.* The Bohlen Lectures for 1891. By W. R. HUNTINGTON. (London: James Nisbet and Co.)

THE Bohlen Lectures are, in a word, the American 'Bampton.' They are founded on precisely the same lines, and the subject is to be such as is within the terms set forth in the will of the Rev. John Bampton. In one respect we heartily wish that our future Bampton lecturers would take a leaf out of the book of their American cousin. The Bampton lecturers of the past have given us a vast amount of most valuable divinity, and are, as a body, well worthy of a Church whose traditions have ever been those of a learned Church. But many of them—we do not say all—labour under the fatal defect of being unreadable, and still more, if we may coin a word, unhearable. We are old enough to remember a head of a college, in the days when heads of colleges were sometimes sporting men, who used to say that to listen to a Bampton lecture was harder work than a hard day's hunting. Now Mr. Huntington is eminently readable. While in point of ability he is well worthy of being ranked with the best of the Bampton lecturers, he does not stand too much upon his dignity. He is not afraid of being bright, sparkling, nay, downright humorous. The very titles of his lectures would shock the prim propriety of most Bampton lecturers. His first lecture he calls a 'Protocol.' The next four are termed generically a 'Quadrilateral,' and specifically 'The Archives,' 'The Credenda,' 'The Signs and Seals,' and 'Pilotage'—the text of each being, not a verse of Scripture, but one of the four 'data,' agreed upon in the Lambeth Conference of 1888, 'essential to the establishment of a visible unity among Christians;' the sixth and last, 'A Church Established by Love.' Speaking generally, we can use no milder term than to say that it is a delightful book. The sustained force of the arguments, the purity and liveliness of the style, the appositeness of the illustrations, the keenness of the satire, which has in it no admixture of ill-nature, the firmness of the faith, and many other merits too numerous to specify, are beyond all praise. The two lectures on the 'Archives' and the 'Credenda' are two of the most forcible essays we have met with for many a long day on the subjects of which they respectively treat—that is, the defence of Holy Scripture and of a dogmatic religion founded on the

Apos  
unabl  
woul  
follow  
Passi  
views  
we w  
fortre  
in th  
natio  
Mr. L  
Episc  
thoug  
each  
which  
apply  
to us  
high  
his i  
Meth  
tende  
frater  
grega  
aught  
Histo  
so ve  
tative  
find a  
about  
—is s

'E  
variou  
by ge  
one o  
way?  
policy  
local  
worsh  
tions  
presen  
worsh  
words

Si  
a witt  
was fu  
mean  
tingto  
certai  
uncle  
anoth



Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. And yet we regretfully add that we are unable to see our way to the general conclusion which the lecturer would have us to draw. We are sadly afraid that he is after all only following a phantom—a beautiful phantom, but a phantom still. Passing over what we cannot help considering some most inadequate views of the Signs and Seals—that is, the Sacraments of the Gospel—we would dwell now upon his idea of what is meant by the fourth fortress in the Quadrilateral—'The Historic Episcopate locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called by God into the belief of His Church.' Mr. Huntington draws a marked distinction between the Historic Episcopate and the Apostolical Succession, and appears to think, though he is not very clear upon this point, that it only means that each religious community should be governed by a threefold order, which it respectively calls bishops, priests, and deacons. Now let us apply the definition to a case which comes nearer home to him than to us—we mean the case of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The highest ministers in it are called bishops; it therefore must satisfy his idea of what the Lambeth Conference meant. But then the Methodist bishops in America fully recognize the Methodist superintendents in England, and the Methodist superintendents in England fraternize with the Baptist pastors, and Baptist pastors with the Congregational pastors. The difference is merely in names, so that for aught we can see they are all alike; but, if so, what becomes of the Historic Episcopate? Mr. Huntington is so very able and evidently so very sincere a man that one puts this question modestly and tentatively; but we are bound to say that, for the life of us, we cannot find an answer in his book. The practical result which is to bring about 'The Peace of the Church'—a 'Church by love established'—is summed up thus:—

'But what is to hinder that within the pale of a consolidated Church various methods of worship should be in use side by side, at least until by general consent, and in virtue of the law of the survival of the fittest, one or another of them had come to be recognized as the more excellent way? A practical method of constitutionally carrying out this inclusive policy would be the one already suggested, namely, that of classifying local churches under such titles as congregations of the Anglican rite, worshipping in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer; congregations of the German rite, worshipping in accordance with what are at present known as Lutheran forms; and congregations of the Puritan rite, worshipping without any liturgy at all, except in so far as the sacramental words of institution may be said of themselves to make a liturgy' (p. 236).

Sixty years ago Dr. Arnold propounded some such scheme, which a witty prelate compared to the ark, the type of the Church, which was full of all sorts of clean and unclean animals. We are by no means comparing any of the heterogeneous worshippers in Mr. Huntington's consolidated Church to unclean animals; but they would certainly have this in common with the animals in general, clean or unclean—that, except by a miracle, they would never agree with one another. The union of Christendom is, God knows, a thing to be

prayed for and yearned for and worked for ; but we cannot but think that it must be brought about by other means than those which Mr. Huntington suggests, and we fear that some of the bishops will see with dismay the turn which Mr. Huntington gives to some of their peaceful proposals.

*Fourteen Years in Basutoland. A Sketch of African Mission Life.*

By JOHN WIDDICOMBE, Rector of St. Saviour's, Thlotse Heights, and Canon of Bloemfontein. (London : The Church Printing Company.)

It would be a poor compliment to the writer of this little book to say that it is as interesting as a novel ; for there is not a dreary page in it from beginning to end, and of how many novels could this be truly said ? In a fine, manly tone, which carries conviction, and in terse, lively style, Mr. Widdicombe tells the tale of his fourteen years' life and work for Christ in Basutoland. Without any boastfulness, but by a simple record of facts, he gives us a vivid impression of an important Mission field, and of the indomitable perseverance of the Mission of which he himself was a 'pioneer and founder.' We are not going to spoil the reader's pleasure by attempting to give any summary of a book which is itself a summary, and which every one interested in the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom—in other words, every sincere Christian—should read for himself ; but simply to note two or three points which specially struck us. One is, that so far as Basutoland is concerned, and we fancy that the remark would apply to other parts, the objections of heathen nations to missionaries as missionaries are purely imaginary. Several times Mr. Widdicombe records the application for 'teachers' on the part of native chiefs, who were not, and had not the slightest intention of becoming Christians themselves ; but he does not record a single instance of objection being taken by any heathen to the Christians imparting their instruction. On the other hand, the difficulties with which the missionaries had to contend are vividly portrayed ; one in particular, which we have not often seen noticed, but which must be of frequent occurrence. One often hears of the damage which the inconsistent lives of so-called Christian white men do to mission work ; but not so often of the damage done by the inconsistencies of native converts. And yet there must often be such ; and Mr. Widdicombe, in that spirit of candour which pervades his whole work, does not conceal the fact. When men become Christians they do not cease to be men ; and we need no more wonder that men just rescued from heathenism should retain traces of their heathenism after they have discarded it, at the present day, than that they should have done so at Corinth in the days of St. Paul. Hence one can well understand the troubles which Mr. Widdicombe met with from what he calls 'the offscouring of Christian Missions' (see p. 46), and from the falling away of his chief catechist. Again, the book illustrates how fearfully dependent English Missions are upon the character which the English bear. For a while the Basuto Mission seemed to be progressing favourably. But the unfortunate Zulu war broke

out ;  
indirect  
loss of  
crippled  
broken  
touching  
of the  
was im  
is mor  
hard r  
Mission  
Cathol  
or actu  
several  
to rem  
the im  
privati  
said th  
are som  
mission  
found  
When,  
peace  
their  
must h  
ing, a  
placed  
report  
devote  
then h  
taste,  
the mo  
priest,  
hardsh  
the tru  
he dw  
the oth  
straw w  
past w  
his tru  
not ye  
his pro  
therefo  
yet mo  
the pas  
graphic  
Moshe  
his dec  
his viv  
descrip

out; and, apart from the actual troubles which, directly or indirectly, resulted in the neighbouring Basutoland, the mere loss of prestige which the British name suffered tended to cripple its energies. By the rebellion of 1880 the Mission was quite broken up. Mr. Widdicombe exercises a laudable self-restraint in touching upon politics, but he cannot help showing that the attempt of the Colonial Government at Cape Town to disarm the Basutos was impolitic and disastrous, and there is a certain soreness, which is most natural and justifiable, in the account he gives of the hard measure dealt to those who were induced by the Anglican Missionaries to remain loyal and give up their arms, while the Roman Catholic and French Protestant Missionaries either remained neutral or actually sympathized with the insurgents. The courage and perseverance—let us rather say faith—which enabled the missionaries to remain firm at their posts during the three trying years, 1880–1883, the imminent dangers to which their lives were exposed, the terrible privations they underwent, should be carefully noted. It may be said that they were only doing what soldiers do every day, but there are some who admire the brave soldier and despise the peaceful missionary; such may learn from this book that heroism can be found under a black coat as well as under a scarlet one. When, after many hair-breadth escapes, the missionaries found peace once more established, they set themselves at once to begin their work all over again; but what a heart-breaking task it must have been! We have, however, scarcely a word of murmuring, and not one of despondency from our author. He was placed there to do a certain work, and do it he must, through evil report and good report; do it though one after another of his devoted friends was cut off—first, a promising young lay-helper, then his own young wife, of the loss of whom he speaks in excellent taste, and with a touching simplicity which is more eloquent than the most piteous complaints; then others, and last of all his brother-priest, Mr. Champernowne, his companion in all his dangers and hardships. To some it may seem ludicrous, to us it seems one of the truest touches of nature in the whole book, that the loss on which he dwells at most length is that of a favourite cat! It followed upon the other losses, which of course he felt more deeply; it was the last straw which broke the camel's back. When this last link with the past was severed the strong man fairly broke down and wept; but his trust in God soon enabled him to recover himself. His work is not yet done; he has been thirty years in Africa, and fourteen in his present Mission on the Thlotse Heights, Basutoland, and can therefore write with authority; but we trust he may be spared to do yet more work, and to tell us about it as well as he has told us about the past. We had marked many other points for notice, such as his graphic sketches of the Basuto chiefs, notably the two greatest, Moshesh and his grandson Jonathan; his loyalty to his bishop, and his deep appreciation of the services rendered by him to the Mission; his vivid account of a visit from General Gordon; his exciting description of the intertribal war in 1883. But we have already

exceeded our limits, and must be content with heartily commending the whole book to our readers.

*St. Chrysostom and St. Augustin.* Studies in Christian Theology. By PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. (London: Nisbet and Co., 1891.)

A NEW series of the kind which is apparently so much in demand at the present day, begins well with the lives of the greatest of the Greek and the greatest of the Latin Fathers, written by one who is an acknowledged authority in patristic studies, and in Church history generally. Dr. Schaff gives us in about forty pages a well-condensed, discriminating, and perfectly readable account of St. Chrysostom, and in about a hundred an equally good, but more vivid and picturesque account of St. Augustin. His sympathies are clearly with the Latin rather than with the Greek Father; but he does full justice to the eloquence of the 'golden-mouthed' preacher, and we are glad to see that he calls attention to the excellent biography of St. Chrysostom by Mr. W. R. W. Stephens.

In his sketch of the great Bishop of Hippo he is wise enough to draw largely upon the inimitable autobiography contained in *The Confessions*, and we are particularly pleased to notice that he combats the utterly false opinion that St. Augustin was merely a sensual profligate before his conversion, and very properly reprobates the abominable insinuation of Lord Byron on the subject. That St. Augustin was not a moral man, according to the Christian standard of morality, is, of course, undeniable; but he was not worse—indeed, not nearly so bad, as many of his heathen neighbours; there was always a yearning in his heart after better things; he never wholly shook himself free from the influence of his incomparable mother—whose name Dr. Schaff rightly spells 'Monnica' not 'Monica'—and he never ceased to take a deep interest in all intellectual, but especially theological, questions. If it were not presumptuous to criticize so great a writer as Dr. Schaff we should be inclined to say that even in so short a sketch a little more space than a single page might with advantage have been devoted to '*The City of God*.' St. Augustin was a most voluminous and invaluable writer; but, except to the learned, he is chiefly known as the author of *The Confessions* and of *The City of God*. The magnificent conception of the true city of God rising on the ruins of the Eternal City, seems to us a stroke of genius to which there are few parallels. As might be expected, there are a few expressions which jar upon the feelings of English churchmen. We do not like to hear of 'John' and 'Paul,' especially when we hear of 'St. Basil' and 'St. Chrysostom'; and the division into 'Catholics' and 'Protestants' is, of course, in our eyes, a false and most objectionable division. But with the general tone of the volume we are thoroughly in sympathy; and it is a real boon to have in so short a space the account of two of the very greatest names in the Christian Church written by one who is a master of his subject.

THIS  
the G  
missi  
unjus  
into  
peopl  
bisho  
endea  
laid c  
of his  
of the  
speak  
Withi  
inland  
betwe

'Y  
or Sou  
days a  
cannot  
ing the  
in plac  
fortress  
iron.  
popula

Bu  
Matab  
whatev  
towns  
whilst

'Th  
ance, an  
chief, le  
with the

A fi  
to secur  
life hid  
Bruce,  
requisite

'He  
there fro  
for fifty  
gula del  
Mashona  
in its wi  
always l  
to Lohen  
VOL.

*Journals of the Mashonaland Mission, 1888 to 1892.* By G. W. H. KNIGHT-BRUCE, Bishop for Mashonaland. (London: Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1892.)

THIS most interesting and encouraging account of efforts to spread the Gospel deserves special attention from all interested in the foreign missions of our Church. It is often accused (perhaps not always unjustly) of permitting others to precede it in sending missionaries into countries that from circumstances seem to invite Christian people to seek their conversion. Happily in Mashonaland the good bishop of the adjoining region of Bloemfontein was attracted to endeavour to plant the Church, so soon as the country seemed to be laid open to Europeans, and in this little book we have an account of his labours. The Bishop tells us that between the northern border of the Transvaal and the Zambesi is a large country, lying, roughly speaking, between latitudes  $22^{\circ}$  and  $16^{\circ}$ , that was very vaguely known. Within its borders there were a few Portuguese stations, and far inland to the west a great nation known as the Matabele, while between the two lay a land that was waiting to be rediscovered.

'Yes, rediscovered; for Mashonaland is the only district in Central or Southern Africa that seems to have had a past history of busier days and more civilized culture. Which of the centuries saw it we cannot say, nor who the settlers were, nor when they passed away, leaving their mark behind in numberless old shafts, not deep, but so numerous in places as to alter the whole surface of the ground; in strongly-built fortress towers, and possibly in the Mashona knowledge of smelting iron. The country is in many parts very beautiful, and in many thickly populated' (p. 2).

But this region was desolated by the powerful nation of the Matabele, who periodically raided it, carrying off the crops and whatever movable property they could lay hold of, burning the towns and villages, and making slaves of the younger captives, whilst they killed the older ones.

'The poor Mashona were incapable by nature of offering any resistance, and their disintegration into separate tribes, with no one paramount chief, left them helpless before the disciplined power of the Matabele, with their thousands of fighting men in organised regiments' (p. 2).

A first step to obtain a peaceful entrance into this country was to secure the consent of the great Matabele chief, who was making life hideous for the unhappy Mashona. Accordingly Dr. Knight-Bruce, then Bishop of Bloemfontein, went up in 1888 to obtain the requisite permission to endeavour to Christianize the land.

'He reached Lohengula's kraal in May, and met with great kindness there from the London Society's missionaries, who have been carrying on for fifty years the work Dr. Moffat began among the Matabele. Lohengula delayed as long as possible before giving the Bishop the "way into Mashonaland," i.e. permission to enter. To go into any native country in its wild state without this permission from the ruling chief almost always leads to grave trouble' (p. 3). 'Day after day the Bishop went to Lohengula's kraal. Sometimes he was alone, sometimes surrounded

by his headmen. Then he was more difficult to convince. Some of his arguments were quaint: "I am the proper person to say if the teachers are wanted" was one. The reason of the delay was obvious. "He knows if your mission settles there it is good-bye to his raids," said a trader' (p. 4).

At last the desired leave was given, and the Bishop started at once to explore the country, the first missionary who had entered it.

'A great many chiefs were visited through all the district up to the Zambesi. They were all fairly gracious, but very childish, dirty, and savage. Clothing there was none, until those under Portuguese influence in semi-Arab dress near the river were reached. In one village all the people ran up to the top of a high hill and hid among the rocks, horrified with their glimpse of a white man. Their ideas on religion were few and vague. One tribe lived in awe of an old man on a mountain; another said their chief knew about heaven, and what happened after death, resting satisfied with this delegated faith; another village had a subterranean cavern, apparently treated as sacred, for they would not allow the Bishop, as a white man, to go down to it. Here too the men spoke more freely about their religion, saying that God lived in the sky, though once He had lived with them, before the Matabele drove Him away; that God had made them and taught them to sow; and that they learned all this from their chief' (pp. 6-7).

The Bishop remarks—

'No one who has not had dealings with the really heathen native can credit what a degradation of humanity they are. To live somewhat intimately among them is the best refutation of the belief that heathen natives are better than Christians, and is the strongest argument for the necessity of raising them' (p. 9).

And again—

'Upon the question of native servants who are not Christian being better than those that are I can only speak from my own experience. If I had another difficult journey to do I should try to take with me only Christians' (p. 11).

Exploration was one thing, occupation another. In the short interval that separated the two great changes took place. Mr. Cecil Rhodes, the Prime Minister of the Cape, obtained the concession of mining rights over all the land from the Matabele chief; the South African Chartered Company was formed; the African bishops constituted Mashonaland into a separate missionary diocese, and appointed Bishop Knight-Bruce to take charge of it. Moreover, gold having been discovered in the country, Englishmen poured into it. In May 1891 'the Bishop gathered together a small party, including some lay workers, three ladies (certificated nurses) who volunteered for work in one of the Company's hospitals, and five excellent native Christians, who were eventually to act as catechists, their own language being somewhat akin to that of the Mashona' (p. 13). The Bishop's plan was to visit the various chiefs, and persuade them to receive a teacher, and to supply him with a hut in which to live. In this he was most successful, a map prefixed to the little volume



shows that no fewer than thirty chiefs had expressed their willingness, and in some cases their desire, to receive Church of England teachers. The lesser chiefs are for the most part under the influence of some greater chief, and at first they made their consent dependent upon the approval of their overlord; but when this was obtained, as it was in all cases, no further difficulty was raised. The catechists whom the Bishop took with him have all been placed, and huts provided for their residence. Canon Balfour is acting as chief missionary in the country, and the work seems to have been placed in a most promising position. One of the chief difficulties with which the Bishop had to contend was locomotion. Owing to the ravages of the tsetse flies, beasts of burden could not be used in some parts, and bearers were scarce; so that the Bishop had to do a large amount of his travelling on foot. The ladies who came to act as nurses had to walk the whole distance to Fort Salisbury—140 miles—where they were to be located. This they happily accomplished; but Dr. Doyle Glanville, who accompanied them, unhappily fell a victim to the climate, and died of fever and exhaustion by the roadside a few miles from his destination. The impossibility of obtaining necessary articles, on account of the difficulty of carriage, must sometimes have been very trying. On one occasion the Bishop writes, 'Gladly would I give 10*l.* for two bricklayer's trowels.' On another, 'I am reduced by dirt to offer 5*s.* a bar for common soap, but I cannot get it.' 'I am told that candles are selling for 15*s.* a packet in camp, and calico' (presumably the 2½*d.* a yard barter stuff) 'at 2*s.* a yard.' 'At a native's hut on the road I bought eight ship's biscuits for 4*s.*' With the mention of one of the moral difficulties to be overcome we close this notice.

'By the noise as we came near the village we gathered that a "beer drinking" was going on. The drink is made from Kafir corn, and can be made very strong, though cool and not unpleasant in taste. The concoction may be different, but the results are much the same as they would be at home. A "beer drinking" is a serious ceremony. It is announced for a certain day, when all the natives near crowd into the village, and the great pots of beer are brought out by women. The wretched scene goes on all day and night; the men, and in some places the women, drink to stupefaction, then sleep, then wake to drink again, till sometimes horrible results ensue. When one is told of the superiority of the heathen to the Christian natives, and of the advantages of leaving missionary work alone, such scenes as this come into one's mind, and one thinks of the numberless faithful converts who, concerning these things, "have put off the old man"' (p. 53).

*Christian Monasticism from the Fourth to the Ninth Centuries of the Christian Era.* By T. GREGORY SMITH, M.A., Hon. LL.D., Edinburgh, Author of *Aristotelianism* (the *Ethics*), *Characteristics of Christian Morality*, &c., &c. (London: A. D. Innes and Co., 1892.)

OUR acquaintance with Dr. Gregory Smith's admirable articles on different branches of this great subject in the *Dictionaries of Christian Antiquities and Christian Biography* published by Mr. Murray led

us to look forward with much pleasurable expectation to the appearance of this volume. The minute and varied knowledge of a mass of details and the wide reading which Dr. Smith's articles evinced; the additional stores of learning which other contributors to the Dictionaries had supplied; the singular picturesqueness of the earlier ascetics from Simon Stylites and Pacomius downwards; the vivid insight into the desert life of the Egyptian hermits as portrayed with so graphic a pen in the pages of De Broglie; the striking portrait painted at first hand in the biography of St. Antony, included in the works of St. Athanasius—all these and many more authorities are at hand to furnish materials for an interesting monograph, and Dr. Gregory Smith is well acquainted with them all. It was a grand subject and a grand opportunity—for early Christian monasticism is a field of English literature as yet almost untrodden, and it abounds in golden ore capable of being smelted and cast into 'a thing of beauty.' Given only adequate breadth of knowledge, the magic touch of a sparkling style, and so much historic imagination as enables an author to live over again in the past, and a really brilliant work must have inevitably followed.

Alas for all such visionary thoughts! *Christian Monasticism* must, we fear, be pronounced almost as 'dry as a dictionary.' Instead of recasting his materials into a more attractive shape, Dr. Gregory Smith has been content to reproduce little more than the bare bones of the articles from his namesake's famous encyclopædia, and the result is much less happy than under different treatment it might have been. Those who are satisfied with an abundant array of facts collected and arranged in somewhat disjointed fashion will, no doubt, find in Dr. Gregory Smith much that is of unfailing interest. But just as a skeleton which is full of anatomical interest in a museum is but a grotesque piece of furniture for an ordinary living room, so we look for different handling in a volume designed for general reading from that which is suitable for a copious work of reference.

This blemish of dryness apart, we have nothing but praise to accord to the *Rise of Christian Monasticism*. It is crammed with facts almost to repletion, and every page bristles with references to the authorities on which the writer's statements are founded. As we read on we feel we are under the guidance of one who has spared no pains to master the literature bearing upon his subject, and that the long list of authorities quoted at the end of the volume is not a mere parade of the 'Index learning that makes no cheek pale.' Dr. Gregory Smith writes with judicial calmness, and holds the balance fairly in his discussion of a problem which has provoked the most enthusiastic championship and the most intolerant antagonism. His own estimate is not obscurely shadowed in the opening paragraph of the introduction to his work.

'Monasticism ranks amongst the most powerful influences which have shaped the destinies of Christianity and of civilization; and the attempt to analyze it is more than usually difficult, because the good and the evil in it are blended together almost inextricably. To those who contemplate it from a distance, wrapped in a romantic haze of glory, it may appear

a sublime and heroic effort after superhuman excellence. To others, approaching it more nearly and examining it more dispassionately, it seems essentially faulty in principle, though accidentally productive of good results at certain times and under certain conditions. They regard the blemishes, which from the first marred the beauty of its heavenward aspirations, as well as the more glaring vices of its later phases, as inseparable from its very being. . . . What proportion of truth is in each of these conflicting theories a careful study of the facts, so far as they can be ascertained from history, may help to determine' (pp. 1, 2).

In pursuance of this study during the period within which he limits the scope of his book Dr. Smith first traces the growth of Christian monasticism, then gives a rapid sketch of various monastic officers and usages, and concludes with a series of biographical outlines of some of the more notable monks, from St. Antony of the Desert down to Chrodegang. The mere enumeration of these contents in a book which only contains matter enough to fill 150 pages of this *Review* may probably of itself explain the frigid conciseness on which we have already enlarged. The origin of Christian monasticism is assigned to the yet earlier tendency to asceticism which sprang up under the combined influences of Judaism and the Platonic philosophy, and which was distinctly fostered by the system of Pythagoras. The natural result of persecution in driving Christians forth from the cities to remote retreats in the desert was intensified by 'something in the climate and associations of Egypt which predisposed men to abdicate the duties and responsibilities belonging to active life' (p. 23). By degrees asceticism, from being the common attribute of Christianity, became the distinctive speciality of a class, and individual devotion to it was furthered and propagated by such great Church leaders as Basil, Jerome, Athanasius, Ambrose, and Augustine.

Perhaps the most interesting part of Dr. Smith's book is its first portion, in which the development of monasticism is described from its starting-point in the separate cells of individual hermits—each of them at first subject to no outward authority—onwards through the union of a large number of such scattered monks under a superior with ill-defined authority, until it took its definite shape in the cloistered community organized under obedience to the Benedictine rule. The mutual relations of the monks and the clergy and the intermediate position of the Canonici form the subject of two chapters which abound in information here conveniently gathered to hand. The second part of *Christian Monasticism* explains the duties and powers of the various monastic officers, such as abbat, prior, dean, and cook. The last of these a person of no mean importance in an institution where hospitality ranked amongst the most sacred of religious duties, and the guest-house was hardly second to any other object as the *raison d'être* of the community. The novitiate, the discipline, the daily life are all detailed. The government was a paternal despotism, tempered only by the rule of the society, and the constant tendency to degeneration demanded—and from time to time obtained—the legislation of such heaven-born statesmen as the two Benedicts and Chrodegang.

The biographical outlines would have been more satisfactory if they had been given in greater detail and had been placed in deeper perspective by a fuller account of the conditions amidst which these heroes of the desert and the cloister spent their lives. The halo of legend cast around them, even in its most extravagant extension, is but a part of the atmosphere through which they were seen by their contemporaries, and without it we cannot fully realize the spirit of their times. Yet, despite such defects as we have indicated, the *Rise of Christian Monasticism* is a contribution of real value to the literature of its subject. It supplies a vast mass of information in a convenient and accessible form. It fills a sensible gap in our current Church history. And we trust, in the author's words, it may stimulate others to follow, with equal conscientiousness of research, in the same direction.

*The Accession of Queen Mary; being the Contemporary Narrative of Antonio de Guaras, a Spanish merchant resident in London.*

Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, Notes, and an Appendix of Documents, including a contemporary Ballad in Facsimile, by RICHARD GARNETT, LL.D., Keeper of Printed Books, British Museum. (London: Lawrence and Bullen, 1892.)

THIS is a book *de luxe*, beautifully executed in a square form, which we suppose we must designate a small quarto, containing in the notes and introduction all that could be desired to illustrate the subject. The printing is excellent, and we have detected only one error due to the compositor in the whole of the work. In the last line of p. 93 the word *last* has been printed for *least*, the word in the original being *menos*. Another trifling mistake, which we must put down to the editor, is the reference in the notes, p. 131. *As soon as the said Northumberland*, where the text omits the two words *the said*. The original text is given, and this is followed by an accurate translation, written in a style which reminds us rather of the sixteenth than the nineteenth century. The colophon of the Spanish copy in the British Museum, from which it has been printed, bears date March 23, 1554. And, as Dr. Garnett observes, Guaras having written his account of Mary's accession and Northumberland's execution in the latter part of the month of August, has the advantage of being the first regular narrator in the field, and no one, we think, can have read his account of Northumberland's death, of which he was an eyewitness, without coming to the conclusion that we have here a more trustworthy account of his last dying speech and confession than historians have hitherto presented us with.

There is not, indeed, much that is new in the Spanish writer's account of what he had seen and heard, but its general trustworthiness is guaranteed by its for the most part falling in with what has been related by others; whilst in some particulars, where he differs from other historians, he seems to have had better opportunities of judging than most who have described the same transactions. His account of Northumberland's speech falls in with three or four other accounts which have been preserved. And it is remarkable that

neit  
dist  
at h  
of t  
Nor  
tion  
Som  
Bish  
He  
had  
been  
mon

as r  
assi  
mov  
took  
unli  
cert  
que  
Gu  
acce  
Mar  
poi  
seen  
stat  
but  
We  
Gre  
roy  
how

Gu  
dec  
eve  
part  
and  
mon  
else  
scar  
So  
is a  
abo  
live  
mu  
the  
to  
Ca  
in  
but

neither this nor any of the others give any countenance to Burnet's distinct assertion that he averred that he 'had always been a Catholic at heart.' Guaras, of course, writes with a prejudice against the men of the New Learning, and appears to have a special dislike for Northumberland, who he thinks was the main cause of the execution of the Earl of Surrey, as well as of the death of the Duke of Somerset and his brother the admiral, and the imprisonment of the Bishops of London, Durham, Winchester, Worcester, and Chichester. He does not, however, vouch for what he evidently believes, that he had resolved to kill the king by poison, about which he says it had been rumoured, and that the poor innocent languished for seven months.

There is one particular in which he differs from other historians as regards Mary's flight from Hunsdon to Kenninghall, which he assigns to July 4, whereas it is commonly said that she did not remove from Hunsdon till she had heard of her brother's death, which took place on July 6. The death had been kept so secret that it is unlikely she could have been on July 9 at Kenninghall, where she certainly was when she wrote to the Council and was proclaimed queen, if she had delayed till the tidings reached her. And thus Guaras's account is probably correct, and falls in very well with the account given to the Signory of Venice by Soranzo, who says that Mary's friends contrived to let her know that the king was at the point of death, whereupon, he says, she took flight. Dr. Garnett seems to be of opinion that Guaras is the only authority for the statement that Mary's flight was in anticipation of Edward's death, but there is at least one historian who has given the same account. We have the fact stated by Mr. George Howard in his *Lady Jane Grey and her Times* (p. 231), that Mary 'set off two days before the royal demise for Kenninghall in Norfolk.' This author does not, however, say from whom he derived the intelligence.

There is one other point on which the opinion of Antonio de Guaras is certainly worth something. Nothing is more difficult to decide with regard to the questions which have arisen as to the events of this time than the comparative numbers of the Protestant party, the men of the New Learning, as they were commonly called, and those who were attached to the old form of belief and ceremonial. In London, no doubt, the Protestant party were stronger than elsewhere. In many parts of the country recent changes had probably scarcely been heard of, even at the end of the reign of Edward VI. So that an estimate of the comparative numbers of the two parties is after all matter of conjecture. Guaras estimates the Protestants as about 4 per cent. of the people. He was a fair judge, for he had lived in London for many years, and spoke English perfectly, and must have had good opportunities of knowing what was going on in the metropolis and its neighbourhood; but perhaps something has to be deducted from his statement owing to his Spanish and Roman Catholic prejudices, and a good deal of allowance has to be made in the calculation for those who were not distinctly of either party, but, like Cecil and other turncoats, sided with whichever seemed to

them the winning faction. As to the value of his testimony in general, Dr. Garnett appears to us to have formed an accurate estimate when he says at p. 25 : 'Judging all things from a Spanish point of view, he shows us the transactions of the time as they appeared to an intelligent Spanish sojourner in the country.' The last chapter of Guaras's contribution gives an account of the proclamation forbidding people to call each other Papists and heretics, and of the order for the release of the nobles and prelates from their imprisonment, and ends with the date and address, London, September 1, 1553. The next seven pages, which detail the events of the coronation on October 1, is a translation from the Italian, which the editor thinks may have been printed at Venice about the beginning of 1554. He does not attempt to explain how a translation by an unknown person has found its way into the account written by Guaras of the commencement of the reign. The account itself is not so full or detailed as others that may be seen in print, but closely resembles that given by Noailles, invariably supporting him when he differs from Strype and other English narratives.

*Mother, Home, and Heaven.* By G. E. JELF, M.A., Canon of Rochester. (London : Innes and Co., 1891.)

MOTHER, home, and heaven have been 'said to be the three most beautiful words in the English language,' Canon Jelf tells us. But if they are so, it does not follow that a book which is founded on them must be a beautiful book. As we glance at some of the headings of the chapters, such as 'At my Mother's Knee,' 'No Place like Home,' 'The State of Unbroken Blessedness,' the pitfalls in its path are very obvious. It is one thing to think of these things, and think lovingly and reverently ; it is another thing to write of them without some treason to the thoughts, through the staleness, or the sentimentality, or even seeming cant of our expression. But Canon Jelf has so written, and the result is a book of great tenderness and beauty.

The connection between the three subjects of the volume is only slightly traced. The part that treats of 'Heaven' is necessarily more contemplative, and more aloof from our daily life, than those which treat of 'Mother' and 'Home.' But the aim of the writer, 'to reach the heart and the life, the will and the affections, with a view to religious action in faith and hope and love,' is never lost sight of ; while he treats of 'Our Father's Home,' 'The Things which are not Seen,' 'Pain and Sorrow unknown,' 'Perpetual Light,' 'Perfect Rest,' 'Songs of Eternal Joy,' 'The Innumerable Company of Angels,' 'The Presence of God'—in Heaven. The light thrown back on earth, the stimulus to holy preparation, the *present* Vision of God through faith, the continuity of the Church on earth and Church in heaven are the strength of the meditations.

But it is the first and second parts of the book—Mother and Home—and the first above all, which enshrine its exquisite thoughts. The mother it portrays is indeed an ideal mother, and the home an ideal home ; and yet there are few of us who will not find some

sacre  
deep  
tions  
cover

'I  
safed  
no lo  
all, w  
moth  
thoug

I  
tent  
to de  
wear

'  
pray  
See,  
prese  
well  
doub  
face  
infan  
for h  
joicin  
he sh

I  
wise

'  
part,  
their  
joys  
at th  
mem  
wrou  
deni  
vant  
as a

Sern

THI  
know  
serm  
Lido  
high  
Life  
Sunc  
man  
and  
Fig-



sacred memories of our several homes, which make the delineation deeply touching to us. We have only room for one or two quotations out of the pages we have marked. In reference to the discovery by the grown-up child of imperfections in the mother :—

‘If sometimes, as you get older, you have painful discernment vouchsafed to you, be not disheartened or turned away because that model is no longer the perfect thing it seemed to you before. For the ideal, after all, was God’s gift to you . . . let us remember that again and again the mother’s heart and the mother’s life are just what they were to our filial thought, calling still for reverence and imitation’ (p. 39).

In the chapter on ‘The Mother’s Sorrow and the Returning Penitent’ the imagery of the prodigal son is used, surely quite legitimately, to describe the mother’s joy over one for whom she has prayed in the weary years :—

‘Oh, joy beyond words to the one whose godly hope and penitent prayers have been so true and faithful to those she loved in the flesh ! See, thy son liveth ; thy daughter is restored. If “there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth,” it may well be that she who is indeed an angel in the house will rejoice with double gladness over the recovery of a lost child. . . . Oh, sad yet happy face of one restored to spiritual life, catching sight of her who trained his infancy and childhood, and who has no word of blame, no harsh severity for him, when at last he comes back again, but rather the thankful rejoicing that his sinful wanderings are over, and the loving resolution that he shall find no place like home’ (p. 64).

In the chapter on ‘Long and Faithful Service’ there are some words about our relations with servants :—

‘Gradually, through patience and forbearance and sympathy on our part, through obedience and unselfishness and straightforward ways on theirs, the tie of mutual regard grows very strong. They share all our joys and all our sorrows. They kneel with us in our family prayers and at the holy altar. . . . Is there not a sacred history, written in the memory of many, which speaks of the quiet influence, the lasting effect, wrought upon life and character by the truthfulness, or courage, or self-denial, the seasonable word, or the mature judgment, of an earnest servant ? . . . A servant so helpful to us is indeed as “a brother beloved,” as a very sister and bosom friend’ (pp. 198–9).

*Sermons on Some Words of Christ.* By H. P. Liddon, D.D., late Canon of St. Paul’s. (London : Longmans, Green and Co., 1892.)

THIS volume, let it be said at once, will take rank with those we know so well. It has, of course, its differentia. If we except the sermons on the Old Testament, the published volumes by Canon Liddon deal as a rule with the central doctrines of the Faith, the high festivals of the Church, the supreme moments in the Incarnate Life of our Lord ; whereas the present one, containing sermons on Sundays after Trinity, and other Sundays and holy days of less commanding dignity, is concerned more directly with the inner reflections and the practical needs of Christian life. Subjects like ‘The Barren Fig-tree,’ ‘The Unjust Steward,’ ‘The Ten Lepers,’ ‘The Pharisee

and the Publican,' 'Christ weeping over Jerusalem,' 'The Cleansing of the Temple' are here treated once again, by Canon Liddon's hand. And the thing which is most obvious in the treatment is, not any effort to view them from some standpoint of surprise, or any shrinking from the duty of stating once again the old unquestionable import of these things, but the direct, intent, reverent study of the fountain of Holy Scripture itself—aided, of course, by Canon Liddon's wide knowledge of Commentaries, but not governed by them, still less reproducing fainter impressions of them—which is the base and strength of every sermon. There is a marked absence of that allusiveness of our literary style, which flatters the more cultivated at the expense of the unlearned. The subordinate subjects, which build up the main theme, are themselves fully presented to the listener; the witness of Holy Scripture to the special truth in point is given, not as a collection of scattered texts, but so as to exhibit the depth of their corroborative force; the account of the leading incident or character or parable is in all instances like a finished portrait, rather than a hasty sketch. In style and manner the volume repeats for us the well-known characteristics of its author: the nervous lucid sentences, the delicate analysis, the noble tone, the occasional irony, the restrained power.

This is, however, not simply a selection from the occasional sermons of a great preacher. As we read it, we are continually reminded of the congregation at St. Paul's, to which with one exception they were preached. More than once the enforcement takes a threefold direction—to the nation, the Church, the individual. Public calamities, such as the Franco-Prussian and the Egyptian wars or the loss of the *Captain*, deaths, such as those of Wilberforce, Bright, and Browning, point the solemn lessons. At one time it is the objection of the man of science or the moralist to 'The Providence of God;' at another the subtle taint of Pharisaism, 'which may waylay and ruin souls which are even eagerly abjuring it, and in the very process of doing so;' at another it is the æsthetic religion, which admires the crucifixion of the Evangelists, as 'one might admire it painted by a Guido or a Vandyck,' which is seized for keen dissection. In the sermon on 'The Unjust Steward,' which ends with a eulogy of the death of Bishop Wilberforce, the stewardship, trusteeship from God, as opposed to inherent independent ownership, of wealth, intellect, position, and influence, time and leisure, is finely pressed on the consciences of his hearers. Warnings against the danger of surrendering some article of the Faith in order to retain the Establishment of the Church are twice given (pp. 69, 290). The duties of the landowner (p. 164 seq.), the profanation of marriage, in the mercenary match-making of the season, which reduces it 'to the brute level of an affair of cash' (p. 174), and as the sequel of this, in the divorce court; the awful peril of 'the mass of unmanageable poverty, the proletarian class increasing steadily year by year, and year by year distancing more alarmingly the efforts to relieve it' (p. 95); the 'power of Christian self-denial poured forth from the throne of Christ both upon the wealthy and the poor' to save society

from  
it is  
T  
Cano  
City  
Jerus  
1886.  
of the  
and  
Addi  
asks.  
'I  
life co  
nal to  
great  
was b  
His st  
can de  
TH  
near t  
Roma  
a  
I  
THE v  
tion w  
incon  
idea o  
stirring  
author  
fruitfu  
life of  
tory of  
more  
and wa  
and th  
memor  
Elliott  
as well  
among  
pass b  
Ambro  
long ro  
dridge,  
poets  
It is o  
lightly  
countri  
absolut  
In the

from the revolution that menaces it—it is the preacher's environment, it is London, that dictates these vital questions.

Two of the sermons have a special interest in connexion with Canon Liddon's life. The vivid delineation of the view of the Holy City from the Mount of Olives in the sermon on 'The Doom of Jerusalem' is evidently the fruit of his tour in the Holy Land in 1886. In the sermon preached on the last Sunday of 1889 he speaks of the great death-roll of the year, which held the names of Bright and Browning and Bishop Lightfoot along with those of Lord Addington and Father Damien, 'What would they say to us?' he asks.

'Do not,' they urge, 'make a mistake as to that in which your true life consists, or prefer the material to the spiritual or postpone the eternal to the things of time. It was to teach you the awfulness and the greatness of your true life that the Highest laid aside His glory, and was born into your little world of sin and shadows. Lay hold then on His strength and pardon, that you may possess that of which nothing can deprive you—His own lasting Presence, His very self' (p. 175).

They read to us like words from the great preacher himself; so near then to his end, and now in Paradise.

*Romance of Psalter and Hymnal.* By the Rev. R. E. WELSH, M.A., and F. G. EDWARDS. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1889.)

THE word 'Romance' in this title seems, from its frequent association with false sentiment and fiction, and baser things than these, incongruous with the sacredness of our psalms and hymns. But the idea of collecting in a volume some of the rich stores of curious and stirring and pathetic incident that cluster round them and their authors is attractive and happy. The long after-history is quite as fruitful in such incidents as the origin of each composition and the life of its writer. In two brilliant pages of *The Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church*, Dean Stanley has massed together the more striking memories of the preciousness of the psalter, to saints and warriors, in times of loneliness and persecution, at the deathbed and the stake; and there is an accumulating treasure of such memories clinging round the hymns of Watts and Wesley, Charlotte Elliott and Lyte, Toplady, Newman, and our great English writers, as well as round the countless hymns of the land of Luther. Then, among the authors of our hymns, what noble and opposite figures pass before us! Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory the Great, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and the two Bernards; Luther and his long roll of successors; George Herbert and Ken, Watts and Doddridge, Cowper and Newton, Bishop Heber, Dean Milman, the poets of the Oxford Movement, the hymn-writers of our own age. It is on this wealth of materials that this book draws. It passes lightly down the ages, leaving none of the leading epochs or the chief countries that have been homes of hymns (France only excepted) absolutely unregarded. The German portion is the most meagre. In the sketches of the lives of Newman, Faber, and Keble, there is

the least evidence of sympathy. Perhaps the portion of the book which is most unfamiliar to us is the concluding chapter, in which Mr. Edwards gives very pleasing portraits of the recent composers of our hymn music—Dr. Gauntlett and Henry Smart and Hopkins, Dykes and Monk, Sir John Stainer, Sir Arthur Sullivan, and Barnby. One or two among other errors that we have observed are all that we can name. The attribution of the 'Veni Creator' to Gregory and the 'Veni Sancte Spiritus' to King Robert of France seems no longer tenable. We must reluctantly surrender the fine stories which connect the composition of 'Ein feste burg' with Luther's peril at the Diet of Worms, and 'Nun danket alle Gott' with Rinkart's deep thanksgiving for the blessed gift of the Peace of Westphalia at the close of the Thirty Years' War. And the story in detail given regarding the origin of Cowper's hymn, 'God moves in a mysterious way,' seems unwarranted by the memoirs of him.<sup>1</sup> One protest must be made. Mr. Welsh points out, what has been pointed out constantly, the striking fact that within the covers of our hymn-books, pieces from the Church of Rome and Church of England, pieces from foreign Protestants and English Nonconformists of differing sects, and even one Unitarian hymn ('Nearer, my God, to Thee,' by Sarah Adams), are found together. But when he draws the inference that in this combination we have an image of the 'true Catholic Church, or Christian Union, or Evangelical Alliance, forecast of the one Church above' (p. 117), none of the editors of Church hymnals can follow him. The selection of hymns for worship is strictly parallel with the quotations from different sources, some of them *sceptical* it may be, which we find in any Variorum Commentary on Holy Scripture. They have their place there for a distinct and limited purpose. The cause of the reunion of Christendom is not helped by sneers at 'dogma' and 'creeds.'

*High Days of the Christian Year: Teachings from the Great Commemorations of Christendom.* By the Very Rev. ANDREW TAIT, D.D., &c., Provost of Tuam. (London: Griffith, Farran, Oke-den and Welsh, 1890.)

By the title *The High Days of the Christian Year*, Provost Tait designates the great cycle of Church festivals which concludes with Trinity. His aim is 'to write a series of comments and reflections on the leading subjects' they bring 'under review.' His method is 'expository' rather than 'hortatory.' The existing treatises on Church seasons seem to him too much to take for granted the acceptance of the great doctrines of the Creed. He insists very justly on the value of the course marked out by the Church, as a check to individual caprice and a means of instructing her children in the whole counsel of God. The plan which he has proposed to himself is to set forth, first, the historic facts at the base of the festivals, next, the doctrines inculcated by them, and thirdly, the lessons which grow naturally out of them. The book is plainly the result of conscientious

<sup>1</sup> See Mr. Julian's *Dictionary of Hymnology*, on these points.

research and thought. A mass of information, familiar in great measure to us as scattered in separate works, has been brought together. Questions of science and philosophy are discussed as well as questions of theology. One of the most interesting chapters, on 'The New Heaven and New Earth,' has some striking quotations from scientific leaders, alike as to the conflagration and the rehabilitation of the physical world. Provost Tait is strongly opposed to evolution, combating it, however, with no new argument, so far as we can gather. The tone of the book is reverent and devout.

We cannot, however, sincerely say that the book is adequate to its purpose. Aspects of the great doctrines, which the current moods of theology forbid us to ignore, are left out of account. There are omissions, some of them capital ones, in the review of the festivals themselves. The liturgical origin in some cases is fully given, and in others entirely omitted. The organic connexion of the constituents of the Great Order is sometimes forgotten, so that they appear as independent instead of correlated themes.

Two chapters are devoted to the Gospels for the second and third Sundays in Lent, which have for their subjects 'the woman of Canaan' and 'the strong man armed.' The relation of these subjects to the cycle of the festivals is of a looser, incidental character; and it is not obvious why these Sundays are admitted while others of the second order are not noted. On the other hand, the festivals of the Circumcision, the Purification, the Annunciation, which, though not on the level of the supreme commemorations of the Church, are celebrations of high moments in the history of the Incarnation, are left without comment. The chapter on the Advent is entirely occupied with a description of the Millennium, which Provost Tait decides to be a real reign of Christ with his saints on earth. But leaving out of consideration that subtle interweaving, by which the Church presents this season to us not only as the contemplation of the second Advent in the future but as the herald of the first Advent in the past, the solemn note struck by the majestic collect for the first Sunday in Advent, which is the exclusive heritage of our Church, is not that of the Millennium but the Judgment; and the gain in awe and solemnity would have been very great if our attention had been concentrated on that glorious and dread consummation, and the thoughts of the revelation of men's hearts the redress of earth's inequalities and Hell and Heaven. The chapters which deal with the Passion are cast in the narrative form, which the Gospels of Holy Week suggest. But it is singular that whereas the point from which, as regards St. Mark and St. Luke, the history commences is the celebration of the passover by our Lord with His disciples, the initial point in Provost Tait's treatment of it is the Garden of Gethsemane; and not even the epistle of Maundy Thursday suggests the consideration of the great Memorial of the Passion, the blessed sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood. It is, indeed, remarkable that on none of the great festivals, where the Proper Prefaces show us the Church consummating her adoration in the celebration of the Eucharist, does any thought of that crown of worship seem to rise. In the chapter on 'Christ's

Priesthood' some recognition and estimate of those theories concerning the spiritual essence of Christ's sacrifice, which Coleridge, Maurice, and eminently McLeod Campbell in his *Nature of the Atonement*, have set forth, and which exercise a great influence on our conception of that mystery, might well have found a place; and the relation of the Kingly to the Priestly office of our Lord in heaven, which the type of Melchisedek presents, as well as the significance of the two distinct moments of Atonement, the mactation of the victim without the veil, and the sprinkling of the blood in the Holy of Holies itself, should surely have been dealt with in greater fulness. This chapter has some beautiful words on Christ's heavenly intercession. But is it quite exact to describe the sprinkling of the blood on the mercy seat as an act of intercession rather than expiation (p. 242)? The action of the high priest in bringing the censer full of burning incense is also described as intercessory, and subsequent to the atonement, whereas in fact it entirely preceded both the mactation and the sprinkling of the blood of the sin offering for the people, and intervened between the mactation and the sprinkling of the sin offering of the high priest; and the object of it (Lev. xvi. 13) is indicated not as intercessory, but for the obscuration of the mercy seat, 'lest' the high priest 'should die.' Again, in the chapter on the Resurrection, although the several appearances of the risen Lord are recounted, the recital is given almost exclusively in view of their cumulative evidential force, while the weighty import of our Lord's utterances, which is brought out in Bishop Moberly's *Great Forty Days*, and those deeply interesting considerations as to the nature of Christ's risen Body, which are so finely indicated in Bishop Westcott's *Revelation of the Risen Lord*, escape notice. And yet once more, in the chapter on Whitsunday, the birthday of the Church, there is only the most passing allusion to the office of the Holy Ghost in quickening and in sustaining her corporate life.

*Theodoric the Goth, the Barbarian Champion of Civilisation.* By THOMAS HODGKIN, D.C.L., Fellow of University College, London. *Heroes of the Nations Series.* (G. P. Putnam's Sons: London and New York, 1891.)

THE fashion of historical handbooks appears at its best when it leads to the production of volumes such as this. Brief sketches of well-known characters or periods may often do more harm than good, by enabling lazy readers to acquire a superficial acquaintance with those portions of history with which an educated person is supposed to be familiar, in place of the fuller study which would otherwise have been necessary. But there are many tracts of history which public opinion has consented to ignore, and which ninety-nine readers out of a hundred do ignore accordingly. The widest and most important of these is that which relates to the fortunes of the later Roman Empire in both its branches, namely the history of Italy from the time of the partition of the Empire to the time of Charlemagne, and the history of the Eastern Empire from its establishment under Constantine to its fall under the last of the

Palat  
dred  
label  
of hi  
grea  
does  
mist  
is h  
the v  
one  
strug  
was  
other  
force  
Chri  
Goth  
mitt  
educ  
given  
ence  
But  
schoo  
to tr  
ordin  
portio  
ignor  
T  
peare  
series  
Emp  
histor  
Mr. I  
an ep  
tion o  
after  
last I  
to car  
ship.  
the O  
Empi  
Empe  
the ha  
of his  
vacar  
rest o  
maint  
many  
partly  
the E  
heren



Palaeologi. The whole of this period, comprising some five hundred years in the West and over a thousand in the East, is neatly labelled 'the Dark Ages,' and then is relegated to the lumber-room of history. It is no doubt true that it formed the subject of Gibbon's great work; but it is to be feared that at the present day that fact does not tend to increase the proportion which has just been optimistically suggested for the students of the later Empire. Gibbon is himself somewhat to blame for this neglect, because he treats the whole period as a 'decline and fall,' refusing to recognize on the one hand the enormous services rendered to civilization by the long struggle which the East maintained against barbarism until the West was ready to receive again the torch of classical culture; and, on the other hand, ignoring, or else being systematically unjust to, the new forces which were arising to shape the new world, the spread of Christianity, and the development of the younger nationalities, the Goths, the Teutons, and the Franks. It may, however, also be admitted that the period does not lend itself well to the purposes of education in history, since it is not creative of new ideas, it has not given its tone to modern history, but merely handed down the influences of an earlier age, and its literature is both scanty and bad. But just because it is a period which will never be read in detail at school, and only by a few students in later life, it is admirably suited to treatment in a popular work of moderate length, which may give ordinary readers some sort of notion of the course of events in a portion of the world's history of which they are as a rule completely ignorant.

Two volumes answering to this description have recently appeared within a few months of one another, belonging to different series, but in size and plan very similar. Mr. Oman's *Byzantine Empire* bridges over with a brief but lucid narrative the gap in the history of the East from Constantine to the fall of Constantinople; Mr. Hodgkin's *Theodoric the Goth* tells at greater length the story of an episode in the history of the West, immediately after the extinction of the Western Empire. Few realize the attempt that was made, after the deposition by Odoacer (more correctly Odovacar) of the last Roman emperor, the significantly named Romulus Augustulus, to carry on the traditions of the Roman Empire under Gothic headship. Mr. Hodgkin shows, clearly and attractively, how Theodoric the Ostrogoth, after a youth spent in aimless forays on the Eastern Empire and aimless quarrels with its emperors, was inspired by the Emperor Anastasius with the idea of an invasion of Italy, then in the hands of the barbarian Odovacar; how he led a great migration of his people thither, conquered, and then, to his shame, killed Odovacar with his own hand; how he ruled Italy as king through the rest of his life, carrying on the machinery of the Roman Empire, and maintaining order as no Roman emperor had been able to do for many years; and how after his death the Gothic rule went to pieces, partly through the determination of Justinian to win back Italy to the Empire, partly, it must be admitted, through a certain incoherence which seems to have been congenital in the Gothic nation.

Theodoric held the structure together during his life, but even he held it with difficulty ; and even if Justinian had restrained his not unnatural ambition, or had possessed instruments less able than Belisarius and Narses, it may still be doubted whether the Gothic kingdom would long have withstood the assaults of external enemies and the disintegrating forces of internal quarrels.

On this period of history Mr. Hodgkin is the greatest living authority, and his present volume only covers the same ground as he has already made his own in the fourth and fifth volumes of his *Italy and her Invaders*. Criticism on the views taken in it would therefore be both rash and unbecoming. Owing to the meagre and unliterary character of the chronicles Theodoric's personality is hard to grasp, and appears to include several traits which one is unwilling to associate with a 'hero.' But his work speaks for itself, his administration is recorded in the *Letters* of his Secretary of State, Cassiodorus, and the chronicles speak of the mark which he impressed upon the minds of his contemporaries. Mr. Hodgkin carries on the narrative after his death to the evacuation of Italy by the Goths ; and though the central figure of Theodoric is gone, the interest cannot flag when it has to deal with the exploits of Belisarius and Narses, and the brilliant stand made by the last of the Ostrogoths, the brave Prince Totila (more correctly Baduila) ; and in a final chapter Mr. Hodgkin treats of the Theodoric of Saga, the Dietrich of Bern who makes so great an appearance in German legend, and whose story, though for the most part possessing no historical basis, testifies to the fame of the real Theodoric. The whole volume is excellent reading, and it is to be hoped that it may do much to propagate, not only an acquaintance with the great Ostrogoth, but also a fuller perception of the function of the Roman Empire in the early Middle Ages, and of the extraordinary vitality of the idea which lasted on, in spite of the apparent ruin of the structure which had embodied it, until it once more took shape in the hands, not of Roman nor of Goth, but in the German Charles and Otto the Great.

*Studies of the Gods in Greece at certain Sanctuaries recently excavated: being Eight Lectures given in 1890 at the Lowell Institute.* By LOUIS DYER, B.A. Oxon., late Assistant Professor in Harvard University. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1891.)

THE title given to this book is somewhat misleading, since it appears to imply that the lectures contained in it are based upon the results of the excavations which have recently been undertaken at several of the most interesting sites in Greece. This, however, is not the fact. Mr. Dyer does, indeed, describe some of the results of excavation at the temple of Demeter at Eleusis, and a reasonably full account is given of the temple of Aphrodite at Paphos in Cyprus ; but with these exceptions scarcely a word is said about sites and excavations. The most that can be urged in defence of the title is that visits to the sanctuaries in question have given Mr. Dyer the inspiration to study and write about the deities who once worshipped there ; but it is the result of the inspiration, not of the excavation, that lies before us in

this  
cord  
Dyer  
terre  
and  
the a  
term,  
pleas  
embo  
in th  
tabul  
A  
and  
worth  
faults  
langu  
dulge  
dange  
and i  
own r  
by co  
but o  
peopl  
sinian  
mann  
the H  
TI  
Diony  
figure  
most  
ducto  
religio  
Christ  
that h  
nexion  
study,  
Greec  
whate  
and si  
Churc  
conver  
religio  
self wi  
desire  
of the  
worshi  
religio  
proper  
ledge.  
the ot  
VOI

this volume. The fact is not to be deplored, but merely to be recorded, in view of possible misconceptions caused by the title. Mr. Dyer has gone mainly to the literature of Greece, not to its disintegrated stones, for his studies of its deities, and his results are religious and literary, not archæological. Consequently his book is not for the archæologist pure and simple, in the narrowest sense of the term, for the mere collector of materials, but for those who find pleasure and interest in the ideas and feelings which those materials embodied. It is for those who look to the thoughts of the Greeks in their great period, not for those who are busied only with the tabulation of the concrete representations of those thoughts.

As a contribution alike to the comprehension of the Greek spirit and to the history of religion in general, Mr. Dyer's studies are worth more than a casual notice. They are not, indeed, without faults. Mr. Dyer's style verges on the florid, and at times his language runs away with him. At times, too, his imagination indulges in flights which pass the limits of sober criticism. It is always dangerous to try to reconstruct the ideas of a people from its myths and its art. It is easy to read into them thoughts which are in our own minds, not in theirs, and to be misled by modern analogies, or by comparison with alien creeds and systems. It can cause nothing but offence to say, as Mr. Dyer says (p. 5), that 'all manner of people were free to come and be initiated at her [Demeter's] Eleusinian sanctuary, excepting only those polluted in some incurable manner, *as who should say, those who had committed the sin against the Holy Ghost.*'

The deities who form the subject of these studies are Demeter, Dionysus, Æsculapius, Aphrodite, and Apollo, all of them prominent figures in Hellenic mythology, and the two first connected with the most mysterious and esoteric rites of Hellenic worship. In the introductory lecture Mr. Dyer dwells on the permanent elements in Greek religion, and in particular on the ideas which it has in common with Christianity. Here he is on difficult ground, and it cannot be said that he handles his subject with much depth or success. The connexion between Greek thought and early Christianity is well worth study, but it is with the philosophy rather than with the religion of Greece that the contact is most observable. The religion of Greece, whatever it was in its earlier and purer days, had lost most of its life and sincerity before the rise of Christianity, and the Fathers of the Church knew it most in its literary aspect, which was also the most conventional. A truer line to take would be to show how in Greek religion at its best there was a revelation of God, Who left not Himself without witness in it. Such an examination might, if it were desired, easily be prefixed to a minuter study, such as Mr. Dyer gives, of the ideas which were at the bottom of the most striking rites and worships of Hellas. To arrive at a clear and true idea of the Greek religion is indeed no easy task. We lack the means of weighing properly the evidence which is available in our present state of knowledge. On the one hand we have the views of the literary men, on the other the legends which represent the ideas of the common

people. On both sides there are dangers. If we take our belief from the writers, we are in great danger of attributing to the Greeks in general at once a too intellectual and a too conventional view of religion. The writers are practical and rationalistic, like Thucydides, or jesters like Aristophanes, or they adapt the ancient myths for their literary and philosophic purposes, like Euripides and Plato. Even in Homer and Hesiod the myths have assumed a literary shape, and it is difficult to tell how much of this adhered to the popular conceptions of religion. On the other hand, if we take the myths as they stand, and endeavour to extract from them their fundamental ideas, we have a strong tendency to read into them more than is there—more, at any rate, than we can legitimately be sure is there. Into this latter danger we think Mr. Dyer has at times fallen; but it is useless to specify instances, since they would require fuller discussion than can be given here; and, moreover, the point of our objection is that the evidence is too uncertain to justify positive views. Whether we agree with Mr. Dyer or not, however, it is refreshing to read a book about Greek antiquities which treats them from the imaginative and poetical side, not as an assortment of details laboriously collected from obscure sources. We do not in the least wish to vilify the office of the archaeologist, of the collector of details, to whose patience, ingenuity, and accuracy the fulness of our knowledge is due. Only, it is to be remembered that it is not the facts in themselves that have value, but the ideas and the spirit which they embody. Mr. Dyer is one of those who, themselves acquainted with the dry bones of archaeology, would clothe them with the flesh that belongs to them; and therefore we welcome his book cordially, and trust it may be of service to maintain and to spread the interest in the thoughts and beliefs of Hellas, which has done, and yet may do, so much for the intellectual development of the modern world.

*Old Testament Difficulties*; being a Collection of Papers written for Working-men. By the Rev. A. F. W. INGRAM, Head of the Oxford House, Bethnal Green. (London: S.P.C.K., 1892.)

THE eleven short papers composing this little volume originally appeared in the *Oxford House Chronicle*, and were addressed to the class of working-men among which the work of the Oxford House is carried on—the ordinary unskilled or only moderately skilled labourer (dock-hand, bootmaker, small tailor, etc.), of whom the East-End is full. They were addressed, in fact, to those who form the audience of the secularist out-of-door lecturer, to men who have interest enough in things religious to listen to what the lecturer says, without enough education or intelligence to check his statements. They are consequently more elementary than, for instance, the *Oxford House Papers* published some years ago, and are expressed as simply and directly as possible. The difficulties dealt with are, moreover, those of the working-man, not those of the scholar. Mr. Ingram is not concerned with the 'higher criticism' of the Psalms or Daniel, but with the elementary difficulties of the books of Genesis and Exodus, with the Creation, the Fall, the wife of Cain, or the

characters of Esau and Jacob. The first two papers discuss 'How we got our Bible,' and are a short analysis of Mr. Paterson Smyth's book bearing that title. The next deals with the inspiration of the Bible, and the rest with certain specific points which often perplex working-men (and others also) in the earlier books of the Old Testament. Mr. Ingram's attitude towards modern criticism appears to us excellent. On the one hand he holds emphatically (pp. 20, 21) that our belief in inspiration does not stop the way to a free investigation of the documents, and that inspiration does not obliterate in the authors of the sacred books the use of human faculties; on the other, he does not think it necessary to adopt as certain the latest views of the most advanced critics, views which at present are at best hypothetical, and in a few years' time may probably be abandoned even by their authors. An opinion is not necessarily true because it is 'advanced'; and on questions of authorship and date the competent scholars may reasonably be asked to make up their own minds before requiring their conclusions to be accepted by the world at large. Religion has nothing to fear from the truth; only let it be cautious in determining what the truth is. Mr. Ingram meets the problems with which he deals in a straightforward, honest, intelligent, and thoroughly religious spirit; and his papers may be strongly commended to those who have to deal with a similar class of men. They would form an excellent skeleton for a course of lectures to an audience of working-men.

*The English Historical Review*, No. 26, vol. vii. April. Edited by S. R. GARDINER, M.A., LL.D. (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1892.)

THE most valuable article in the current number of this Review is that in which Professor F. W. Maitland discusses the exact legal point at issue in the quarrel between Henry II. and Becket concerning the criminous clerks. One view which is commonly taken is that Henry required all clerks accused of temporal offences to be tried in the king's court, against which Becket contended that clerks could only be tried in the ecclesiastical court. But the evidence, as collected by Professor Maitland, seems clearly to show that what Henry demanded was that, while ecclesiastical crimes should continue to be tried entirely in the spiritual court, a clerk accused of temporal crime should in the first instance plead in the king's court, should then, without trial, be referred to the ecclesiastical court and there tried, and if found guilty and degraded (as he inevitably would be on being convicted of serious crime) should be taken back, a layman now, to the temporal court, and there suffer the penalty due to a layman for the offence. Thus the privilege of the Church was preserved, and the offender suffered for his evil-doing. Becket, on the other hand, contended that no further penalty should be inflicted beyond the ecclesiastical punishment of degradation. No doubt in the heat of controversy the king was accused of wishing to try clerks in temporal courts; but the evidence goes to show that this was not strictly the case, and that the king's demand was less of an encroachment on the

M M 2

Church than the archbishop's friends chose to represent it. Mr. R. N. Bain contributes a readable account of the siege of Belgrade by Muhammad II. in 1456, and its successful defence by John Hunyady. Major Martin Hume gives an interesting and somewhat amusing description, from Spanish sources, of the visit of Philip of Spain to England for his marriage with Queen Mary, in the course of which, it is almost needless to add, he has occasion to point out some picturesque exaggerations in the narrative of Mr. Froude. The remaining articles, by Mr. W. Roos and Mr. J. R. Tanner, deal with the share (generally overlooked) taken by the Swedes in the Viking expeditions, and with the connexion of Pepys with the Popish Plot. The reviews include a somewhat belated notice of the newly discovered treatise of Aristotle on the Athenian Constitution, more descriptive than critical; and a sufficiently drastic handling of Froude's *Divorce of Catherine of Aragon* by Dr. Jessopp. Lord Acton contributes a somewhat sarcastic note on the second volume of Mr. Morse Stephens's *French Revolution*. Of the foreign books noticed the most important is Rambaud's edition of the instructions given to the French ambassadors at the Russian court between the Peace of Westphalia and the Revolution. A readable, if not especially interesting, number concludes amusingly with a controversy between the Rev. H. B. George and Judge O'Connor Morris, arising out of a review by the former of the latter's *Great Commanders*. Even the junior fellow of a college on things in general is hardly so infallible as the military amateur on the art of war, and it is most edifying to the onlooker to see two of these critics belabouring one another over the corpses of Wellington and Napoleon.

A  
49  
Asce  
ho  
ga  
ad  
for  
he  
sta  
of  
me  
th  
tio  
tha  
In  
an  
dr  
lif  
As  
tim  
rec  
ce  
ho  
pri  
per  
Ch  
13  
ver  
13  
blo  
pe  
ple  
Ch  
nev  
con  
our  
trin  
ing  
gan  
Ma  
me



## INDEX TO VOL. XXXIV.

### ALE

ALEXANDER, Bishop, *The Leading Ideas of the Gospels*, 491

Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood, the (review of Dr. Milligan's work), 128 *sqq.*; the author's admirable statement of the proofs for the fact of the Ascension, 129; heaven is less a place than a state, 130; spiritual significance of the Ascension, 131; the Atonement was not the final object of the Incarnation, 132; examination of the author's statement that 'without the Ascension the Incarnation is incomplete,' 133; and of the contrast which he draws between our Lord's earthly life and that which follows His Ascension, 134; his physical distinction between the post-resurrection life and that which preceded His death, 136; the Priesthood of Christ, 137; the 'high priest for ever,' 138; the fulness, perfection, and sufficiency of Christ's one oblation of Himself, 139; consideration of the heavenly work of our Lord in glory, 139 *sq.*; the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar and the people was needed to the completeness of a sacrifice, 141; Christ's death did not impress 'a new character' on His life, 143; consequences in the sphere of our earthly worship of the doctrine of Christ's continued 'offering' in heaven, *ib.*; Prof. Milligan's substitute for the Roman Mass, 144; his discussion of the meaning of Intercession as part

### AUT

of the High Priestly office of the Lord, 145; his view of the work of the Holy Spirit, and of the 'Filioque' clause in the Creed, 146; his explanation of the distinction between Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον with and without the article, 147  
 Authority in Religious Belief, the Place of (review of the Rev. Dr. Stanton's work), 265 *sqq.*; the author's standpoint, 265; the antagonism between the principle of authority and that of private judgment, 266; authority cannot be got rid of, except we fall into pure Agnosticism, 268; case of the young and the unlearned, 269; reconciliation of the claims of authority with the subjective reason and faith, 272; the nature of revelation: criticism of Dr. Martineau's views, 273; natural religion or revelation, 275; meaning of revelation in its special sense, 276; how objective revelation is to be authenticated, 277; miracles and the supernatural, 277 *sq.*; the principle of authority in mathematical and physical sciences, 279; mode in which scientific authority is exercised, 280; authority in morals, 281; the sanction of Conscience, 282; the general judgment of our fellow-men in morals becomes an authority, 283; application of these analogies to authority in religion, 283 *sqq.*; indications in revelation itself which show that it comes from God, 284; how it has influenced the martyrs and saintly men and women, 285;

## BEN

why the Christian consciousness is not equally manifest in all believers, 286; the rational ground on which the argument from numbers rests, 287; the argument applied to the reception of revealed truths, 289; Dr. Stanton's treatment of the authority of the Bible and of the Church, 290 *sqq.*; the Canon of Scripture, 291; distinction between revelation and inspiration, 293; meaning of inspiration, 294; no definite theory of inspiration can be proved, 295

BENSON, Miss M. E., *At Sundry Times and in Divers Manners*, 245

Boucher, Rev. J. S., *A Manual of Doctrine and Practice for Church Teachers*, 497

Burton, Dean (review of Dr. Goulburn's *Life of John William Burgon*), 149 *sqq.*; Burgon's birth and early life, 149; matriculates at Oxford at the age of 28, 150; ordination, 151; work as curate of West Ilsley, *ib.*; other clerical work, 152; in Italy and Palestine, *ib.*; work as vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford, 152 *sq.*; his theological standpoint, 153; religious influences of his early life, 154; views respecting the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, 155; objected to, but adopted, the New Lectionary, 156; active opponent of the Revised Version, 157; a zealous searcher for ancient MSS. of Holy Scripture, 157; his principles for textual criticism of the New Testament, 158; his *Treatise on the Pastoral Office*, and other works, 159 *sq.*; his character, 160; a mixture of strange inconsistencies, 161

*But How—if the Gospels are Historic?* 236

CAILLARD, E. M., *The Invisible Powers of Nature*, 256  
Calderwood, Professor, *Handbook of Moral Philosophy*, 254

## CYP

Chandler, Rev. A., *The Spirit of Man*, 248

Confirmation and Baptism, primitive teaching on their relation (review of a work by Canon Mason), 1 *sqq.*; unsatisfactory state of present doctrine of Confirmation, 1; wrong notions of the meaning of the rite, and of its relation to Baptism, 2 *sqq.*; the Scriptural meaning of 'Laying on of Hands,' 5; design and method of Canon Mason's work, 6; his conclusions: that Baptism in primitive teaching included several distinct rites, 7; Scriptural and patristic testimony to the doctrine that the Gift of the Holy Ghost is ascribed to Confirmation as distinct from Baptism, 9 *sqq.*; in the Early Church Confirmation immediately followed Baptism, 12; consideration of some phrases in the English Office for Baptism, 14; distinction between the operation of the Holy Spirit and His Personal indwelling, 15; illustrated by the difference between the Paschal and the Pentecostal Gifts to the Apostles, 16; question of the revival of infant Confirmation, 18; the use of Chrism, 19; Confirmation confers 'character,' 20

Cornford, Rev. J., *The Book of Common Prayer, with Historical Notes*, 490

Cyprian, St., the Correspondence of, 381 *sqq.*; why so much of it has been preserved, 382; Cyprian's great reputation as writer, statesman, and martyr in one, 384; discovery of the Cheltenham List of his writings, 385; difficulty of settling their chronological order, 386; dates of Popes and Emperors contemporary with Cyprian, 387; condition of Christians at the period, 389; persecution of Decius: Cyprian retires and directs his see from a distance, 390; behaviour of his flock under persecution, 391; apostates (*lapsi*), 392; position

## DOU

of Cyprian towards them, 393; the use of *libelli*, 393 *sq.*; correspondence between the clergy and confessors of Rome and those of Karthage, 395; acuter stage of the controversy about the lapsed, 398; disputed election of Cornelius and Novatian to the See of Rome, 399 *sqq.*; Cyprian's action, 401; conciliar decision on the *libellatici*, 403; movement in favour of laxity, 404; persecution of Gallus, 406; exile and death of Pope Cornelius, 407; Florentius Puppianus's attack on Cyprian, 408; Cyprian's widespread influence, 409; the controversy about Rebaptism, 410

DOUGLAS, Hester, *Heavenly Teachings in Earthly Proverbs*, 251

Dyer, Mr. L., *Studies of the Gods in Greece*, 520

ELIZABETHAN Lyrics (review of Mr. Bullen's two volumes), 184 *sqq.*; value of the work as recalling to light forgotten worthies, 185; specimens of charming simplicity: Marston, Campion, Dowland, 187; Robert Jones, 188 *sq.*; Fletcher, 190; the instinctive choice of the best words, a distinguishing mark of the best song-writing, 191; exemplified in Sappho and Pindar, and in Campion, 192; introduction of conceits and quaint fancies or phrases, 193; accumulation of fanciful images to express a single thought, *ib.*; brief period covered by the Elizabethan singers compared with that of the Greek *Anthology*, 194; John Still, Nicholas Udall, Nashe, 195; religious poems, 196; Sir Henry Lee's 'Farewell to Arms,' 197; effect of time and familiarity on poems, *ib.*

*English Historical Review*, 258, 523

Eusebius, the Historical Works of, 95 *sqq.*; importance of his work,

## EXP

95; specimen of the edition and translation in the *Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 96; the author's account of the plan of his work, 96 *sqq.*; earlier works of Eusebius, 98; his custom of producing the *ipsissima verba* of earlier documents, 99; use of good libraries, and of State documents, to which he had access, 100 *sq.*; the method of his compositions suggested by that of the library of Pamphilus, 101; Eusebius probably bilingual (Greek and Syriac), *ib.*; examination of the charge of partisanship brought against him, 102; the alleged letter of Abgarus to Christ and Christ's answer, 103; Dr. Richardson's estimate of Eusebius's account of the character of Constantine, 104; Dr. McGiffert's examination of the charges brought against the *History*, 106; that work is absolutely unique, 107; analysis of its contents, 108 *sqq.*; important position it has held in the Church, 110; Rufinus's and other versions, 110 *sq.*; translations into vernacular languages of Western Europe, 111; Christopherson's Latin version, 112; English translations by Hammer, Samuel Parker, Cruse, 113; characteristics of the edition under review, 114; errors and defects, 114 *sq.*; excellence of Dr. McGiffert's translation, 116; the Prolegomena to the *History*, 117; value of the notes, 118; Dr. Richardson's portion of the volume, 119; the 'patristic scholars' who are assisting in editing this series, 121; need of a standard critical text of Eusebius, *ib.*; account of the editions of Stephens, Valesius, Stroth, Zimmermann, 121 *sq.*; Heinichen, the Oxford (Dr. Edward Burton), 123; later reprints of Burton's edition, 124 *sq.*; outline of what is required for a good edition of Eusebius, 126 *sqq.*

*Expositor*, June 1892, 479

## FIC

**F**ICTION, Modern: Theology and Morality in, 82 *sqq.*; old Evangelical abhorrence of novels, 82; the spell broken by Walter Scott, 83; popularity of the Waverley Novels, 84; good moral tone of the most eminent of Scott's successors, 85; a backward tendency in recent high-class novels, 85; the personal element in *Robert Elsmere* not entirely absent in *David Grieve*, *ib.*; excellent work of Mrs. Humphry Ward in the early portion of the latter novel, 86; skilful bringing out of characters in the second part, 87; defects, especially coarseness in describing details, in the third part, 88; striking pathos displayed in later scenes, 89; criticism of the author's treatment of theological matters, 90 *sqq.*; her rejection of the supernatural side of Christianity, 91; distinctly immoral tone of Lucas Malet's *The Wages of Sin*, 92; flippant use of Scriptural language, 93; tales of anti-Christian or immoral tendency do not take kindly to British soil, *ib.*; marked contrast of Archdeacon Farrar's *Darkness and Dawn* to the above named works, *ib.*; the work can only be treated under the head of fiction, 94; a simpler and purer taste and style desiderated in the writer, *ib.*; good qualities in the book, 95

Fitzroy, Mr., *Dogma and the Church of England*, 233

Fouard, l'Abbé, *The Christ the Son of God*, 210

Fowler, Rev. G. H., *Things Old and New*, 214

Fuller, Thomas, *The Selected Sermons of*, 498

**G**ARNETT, Dr., *The Accession of Queen Mary*, 510

Gell, Hon. Mrs., *The Cloud of Witness*, 238

Girdlestone, Rev. Canon, *The Foundations of the Bible*, 235

## JOH

Gurney, Rev. A., *Voices from the Holy Sepulchre*, 264

**H**ANNAY, Mr., *Rodney*, 261

Hodgkin, Mr. T., *Theodorice the Goth*, 518

Hore, Rev. A. H., *History of the Church of England*, 494

Hoult, Powis, *Dialogues on the Efficacy of Prayer*, 495

Huntington, W. R., *The Peace of the Church*, 500

*Hymnology, A Dictionary of* (ed. Rev. J. Julian), 433 *sqq.*; contents and plan of arrangement, 434; collateral subjects treated, 435; hymns and hymn-writers of Early and Mediæval Church: works of the Jesuit Father

Dreves, 436; Abelard's hymns, 437; Héloïse's objections to the old hymns, 438; some of Abelard's failures, 440; the original of Dr. Neale's 'Oh, what the joy and the glory must be,' 441; hymns attributed to some of the Fathers, 442; alphabetical hymns, 444; the *Te Deum*, 446; Candidus of Fulda's version in hexameters, 447; the *Gloria in excelsis*: Early English verse translation, 448; original of Keble's 'Hail, gladdening light,' 449; the *Gloria Patri*, 450

**I**NGRAM, Rev. A. F. W., *Old Testament Difficulties*, 522

**J**ELF, Rev. Canon, *Mother, Home, and Heaven*, 512

Johnson, Dr.: Dr. Birkbeck Hill's edition of his Letters, 295 *sqq.*; character of the editor's work, 297; the letters to Johnson's mother, his wife, and his step-sister, 299; Miss Hill Boothby, Miss Anna Williams, 300; account of Johnson's friend, John Taylor, 301 *sqq.*; love for Lichfield, 303; friendship with the Thrales, 303 *sqq.*; death of Mr. Thrale, 305; changed attitude of Mrs. Thrale towards Johnson, 306; her marriage with Mr. Piozzi, 307; Johnson's fits of

## KEY

hypochondria, 308; his fervent religious feelings, *ib.*; clouds and 'terrors,' 309; the peace of his deathbed, 310; tonic quality of his Letters, 311; account of Mrs. Thrale's letters to Johnson, 312 *n.*

KEYNES, Mr., *The Scope and Method of Political Economy*,

255

Killen, Rev. Dr., *The Framework of the Church*, 218

Knight-Bruce, Bishop, *Journals of the Mashonaland Mission*, 505

LANE, L. M., *Life and Writings of Alexander Vinet*, 257

Law, Mr., *History of Hampton Court Palace*, 238

Liddon, Rev. Canon, *Sermons on Some Words of Christ*, 513

London Past and Present (by H. B.

Wheatley), 20 *sqq.*; account of Cunningham's *Handbook of London*, 21; some omissions in Mr.

Wheatley's edition, 22; errors, 23; excellent arrangement of the book, 24; account of its contents:

the gates of London, 25; Ludgate: etymology, 26; the

debtors' prison, 27; Newgate: topography, 28; Blue Coat

School, 30; Aldersgate: etymology, *ib.*; interesting details,

31; Izaak Walton, Milton, Bunyan, Defoe, 32 *sq.*; Barbican,

33; Cripplegate, 34; Grub Street, London Wall, 35; Aldermanbury

Postern, Moorgate, Moor Fields, Finsbury Pavement, 36; Fins-

bury Fields, Hogsden, 37; Bishopsgate: Bishop Erken-

wald, *ib.*; Norton Folgate, 38; Shoreditch: etymology, *ib.*;

Bevis Marks, *ib.*; Houndsditch, 39; Aldgate: etymology, *ib.*;

water gates: Billingsgate, Dowgate, 40; Walbrook, Queenhithe

(Edred's Hith), Broken Wharf, 41; Bevis Bulmer's engine for

drawing water from the Thames, 42; Paul's Wharf, Baynard's

Castle, Montfitchett's Tower, *ib.*; parish churches in the City, 44;

survival of ancient dedication

## MOR

names: Sise Lane (St. Osyth), St. Benet Sherehog, St. Dionis Backchurch, St. Vedast (in 'Foster' Lane), St. Faith, 46; prevalence of identical dedications: Mr. Loftie's explanation thereof, 47; destruction of churches by the Great Fire, *ib.*; recent havoc among Wren's churches, 48; St. Antholin's, the first church where the Book of Common Prayer was used, 49; plea for more extensive use of City churches, 51; a suggested church for the police, 52; old monastic foundations, 53

MACLAGAN, Archbishop, *Pastoral Letters, &c.* (Lichfield), 487

Maher, Rev. M., *Psychology*, 259

Medd, Rev. Canon, *The Greek Devotions of Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester*, 480

*Missale ad Usum Ecclesie Westmonasteriensis*, ed. J. W. Legg,

483

Mitchell, E. H., *Forty Days in the Holy Land*, 263

*Moorland Parish, Forty Years in a* (by Rev. Dr. Atkinson), 453 *sqq.*;

special utility of such a book, 453; its varied stores, 454; Dr.

Atkinson's first visit to Danby (his parish), 455; the parsonage

and its inhabitants, 456; the church, the school, the cottages,

457; superstitions: witch and 'wise man,' 458; traces of Odin-

worship, 459; fairies and dwarfs; Hart Hall Hob, 460; customs

about bees, 461; treasures of the barrows, 462; Danby 'British

villages,' 464; Eskdale, 465; village daily life, 466; weddings,

burials, *ib.*; church music, 468; ornithology, 469

More, Sir Thomas (review of Father Bridgett's *Life and Writings of Sir T. More*), 55 *sqq.*;

undying esteem for More, 55; excellence of Father Bridgett's

work, 56; sources for the biography, 57; previous biographers,

58; More's birth and early life,

## MOU

- ib.*; at Oxford and Lincoln's Inn, 59; the great men of the New Learning, 59 *sq.*; Grocyn, Erasmus, Linacre, Lilly, 60; More's admiration of Dean Colet, 61; More's genial temper, 62; choice of a profession: why he would not be a monk, 63; elected member of Parliament, *ib.*; marriage, 64; employed in English political negotiations, and in causes on behalf of the Pope, 64 *sq.*; forced to take office by Henry VIII., 65; More's chief writings before this period, *ib.*; Erasmus's *Encomium Moria*, *ib.*; account of More's *Utopia*, 66; picture of his domestic life, 68; his second marriage, *ib.*; his ideas on the education of women, *ib.*; excellent results shown in the female members of his family, 69; description of his daughter Margaret, 69 *sq.*; his house at Chelsea, and his guests, 70 *sq.*; Holbein's picture thereof, 71; More's life and occupations at court, 72; estimate of Henry's character, *ib.*; relations with Wolsey, 73; made Lord Chancellor, *ib.*; reason of his resignation, *ib.*; the charge that he was a persecutor of heretics, 74; his controversial works, 76; beginning of his troubles, *ib.*; refuses to take the oath required by the Act of Succession: imprisoned in the Tower, 77; resists the appeals of his family, 78; trial and sentence, 79; his last letter, 80; execution, *ib.*; filial piety of his daughter, 81; Erasmus's last tribute to More's memory, 82
- Moule, Rev. H. C. G., *Charles Simon*, 227; *To my Younger Brethren*, 489
- Mozley, Miss Anne: review of her *Essays from 'Blackwood'*, 410 *sqq.*; sketch of her life, 411; aids in improving literature for children, 412; contributions to *Christian Remembrancer*, to *Blackwood*, and to *Saturday Review*, 413; life at Derby and

## PAG

at Barrow, 414; edits the works of her brother, Rev. Dr. Mozley, 415; sketch of his life and works, 415 *sqq.*; Cardinal Newman's choice of Miss Mozley to edit his correspondence, 418; her review of *Adam Bede*, 420; wide range of her literary knowledge, 423; essay on 'Illustration,' *ib.*; 'Hymns of the Populace' and 'Poets at Play,' 425; the Study of Temper, 427; 'Social Hyperbole,' 428; 'Schools of Mind and Manners,' 429; 'The Four Ages,' 431; the freshness and charm of her own old age, 431

NYE, Mr., *The Church and her Story*, 495

OFFICIAL Year Book of the Church of England, 247

PAGANISM, the Last Days of (review of M. Gaston Boisier's work), 162 *sqq.*; scope and character of the work, 163; treatment of Eusebius's narrative of the conversion of Constantine, *ib.*; new relations of Christianity and Paganism following that event, 164; Christianity the parent of religious tolerance, *ib.*; the Edict of Milan, 166; Constantine was official president of both religions, *ib.*; consequent difficulties of impartial neutrality, 167; discussion of Julian the Apostate's character and reign, 168; of public education in the Roman Empire, 169; professors of grammar and rhetoric, 170; student life under the Empire, 171; influence which national education exercised in the Roman world, *ib.*; attitude of Christian teachers towards the prevalent system of education, 172; the final decision of Christian leaders, and its results: Tertullian's *De Pallio*, 173; Minucius Felix's *Octavius*, 174; the writings of St. Augustine, 176; Latin Christian poetry, 177; the Apocryphal Gospels, 178; St. Paulinus of



## PRO

Nola, 179; Prudentius, 181; the charge that Christianity caused the fall of the Roman Empire, 182; perplexity caused by the horrors of the barbarian invasion, 184  
*Pro Fide: Addresses in Aid of Faith, &c.*, 235

**R**ELIGIOUS Equality: the Bitter Cry of Dissenting Clericalism, 358 *sqq.*; the old Dissenters' view of the connexion of Church and State, 348; the new political cry for 'Religious Equality', 350; the meaning of the phrase as now used, 353; the 'decay of Dissent' manifested in acknowledging the Church of England as 'a Church,' 357; the doctrine of Barrowe and Penry, 358; the present demand attributes a kind of ecclesiastical infallibility to the State, 361; and comes almost exclusively from the sects which are 'Clericalist,' *ib.*; Mr. Guinness Rogers's treatment of 'Plymouthism,' 363; real meaning of such statements as 'The Dissenters are a proscribed class,' 365; no actual 'Religious Equality' even among the ministers of the 'Free Churches,' 367; 'too many small reverends,' 369; 'Religious Equality' in the United States, 370; the desire for 'Oxford-bred preachers,' 371; actual position of Dissenting ministers in towns, 373; position of unbeneficed clergy contrasted, 375; the *superiority* of the Separatist preachers to the English parish priests was the original doctrine of Dissent, 377; the Methodist and Calvinist Evangelical conception of the 'true Church,' 379; Mr. Carvell Williams's notion that 'Ireland is the only part of the kingdom where "religious equality" has been attained,' 380

Rickaby, Rev. J., *General Metaphysics*, 221

Russell, Rev. E. F., *Garden Craft*, 244

## SPE

**S**ABATIER, M., *The Apostle Paul*, 230

Schaff, Dr. P., *St. Chrysostom and St. Augustin*, 504

Sermons, Some Modern, 470 *sqq.*; no sign of the alleged degeneracy of the pulpit, 470; examples taken from various schools of thought: Dean Church's *Village Sermons*, 471; his 'Farewell Sermon' at Whatley, 472; Dean Randall's *Life in the Catholic Church*, 473; rules of Christian charity, 474; contrast with Dr. Bonney's Boyle Lectures for 1890 and 1891, 475; characteristics of Archdeacon Farrar's sermons, 476; Bishop Reichel's *Cathedral and University Sermons*, 477; the late Rev. W. H. Simcox's *The Cessation of Prophecy, and other Sermons*, 479

Sidebotham, Rev. Canon, *Pastoral Visitation of the Sick*, 493

Skeats and Miall, Messrs., *History of the Free Churches of England*, 222

Smith, Dr. T. Gregory, *Christian Monasticism from the 4th to the 9th Centuries*, 507

Spencer, Mr. Herbert: his work on *Justice*, 313 *sqq.*; the stages in his great scheme of the 'Synthetic Philosophy,' 314; general character of the present volume, 314 *sq.*; ancient and modern definitions of Justice, 316; Mill's, Sidgwick's, 316 *sq.*; Mr. Spencer's account of the origin of Justice, 317; his definition of it, 319; association with and derivation from the law of Evolution, 320; deductions from the principles, 321; private ownership of land, 322; the right to property, 323; right of bequest, 324; the relations between man and the State, *ib.*; Mr. Spencer's treatment of 'political rights,' 326; economic unsoundness of making the State manager of industrial enterprises, 326; free competition and free contract, 327; compulsory sanitation and compulsory education, 329; the limit of

## STU

- State interference, 330; the function of the State is to follow human progress, and register and secure it by its laws, 331  
 Stubbs, Rev. C. W., *For Christ and City*, 251

TAIT, Very Rev. Dr. A., *High Days of the Christian Year*,

516  
*The Church and her Doctrine* (by various writers), 496

True Rule of Faith, the, the Church of England and, 198 *sqq.*; high popular estimate of the late Mr. Spurgeon and of Cardinal Manning, 198; testimonies from various sources, 199; contrast of the two men from the standpoint of their religious opinions, 200; example of the need of complex testimony to the truth of Christ and of His Gospel, 201; application of the 'two witnesses' of Rev. xi. 1-12; the Christian Church and the Holy Scriptures, 201 *sqq.*; their mutual relation, 203; the defection of the Roman Church and the rebuke of the Book, 204; the Bible put out of sight, 205; 'the music of the English Bible,' *ib.*; the punishment of the Roman Church for its disregard of the Bible, 206; the invention of the theory of an invisible Church, 207; consequent 'hurt' to the other witness, the Church, *ib.*; division, contention, barrenness the result, 208; in the Church of England both witnesses are alike upheld, 209

## WIL

VAN DYKE, Rev. Dr., *The Church: her Ministry, &c.*, 218

WELSH, Rev. R. E., and Edwards, F. G., *Romance of Psalter and Hymnal*, 515  
*What is Truth?* 253

Widdicombe, Rev. J., *Fourteen Years in Basutoland*, 502

Williams, Rev. Isaac (review of of his *Autobiography*), 332 *sqq.*; importance of the work for its account of the Oxford Movement, 332; Mr. Williams's early religious influences, 333; at Harrow and Oxford, 334 *sq.*; ordination, 335; candidate for the chair of Poetry, *ib.*; marriage, and removal to Stinchcombe, 336; influence of the Kebles on his religious opinions, *ib.*; Mr. Thos. Keble's treatment of his poor parishioners, 337; daily services, 338; Williams's account of various leading men of the Movement, 338 *sq.*; progress of Newman's change of opinion, 339 *sq.*; the beginnings of the Movement, 341; growth: *Tracts for the Times*, 342; feeling of older men in the University, 343; accession of Dr. Pusey, 344; the tract on 'Reserve in Religious Teaching,' *ib.*; Ward and Newman, 345; Williams's uneasiness regarding the latter, *ib.*; Newman's Romeward tendency made manifest, 346; only one of the writers of the *Tracts* has joined the Church of Rome, *ib.*; the high religious motive of all the leaders in the Movement, 348

er., *The*  
*try*, &c.,

E., and  
*Romance*  
515

*Fourteen*

02

review of

332 *sqg.*;

c for its

Move-

s's early

333; at

334 *sq.*;

date for

marriage,

hcombe,

ables on

*ib.*; Mr.

at of his

; daily

s account

n of the

gress of

opinion,

s of the

: *Tracts*

eeeling of

ity, 343;

344; the

Religious

nd New-

neasiness

; New-

ncy made

e of the

s joined

*ib.*; the

f all the

at, 348